


NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.



00035412



ENGLAND AND FRANCE

IN THE

15TH CENTURY.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

ENGLAND AND FRANCE

IN THE

FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

The Contemporary French Tract entitled "The
Debate between the Heralds of France and
England," presumed to have been written
by Charles, Duke of Orleans :

TRANSLATED FOR THE FIRST TIME INTO ENGLISH ;

WITH AN

INTRODUCTION, NOTES, AN INQUIRY INTO THE AUTHORSHIP, ETC.

35412
ac

BY HENRY PYNE.

TT 214

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1870.

All rights reserved.

God
942.05
Cha/Eng
35412

ref 944.026



00035412



P R E F A C E.

IN ORDER to avoid embarrassing with details the translation, which follows, such foot-notes only are inserted as will suffice to explain the text, and to point out the few errors of fact which occur in it. Inasmuch, however, as the text is suggestive, and occasionally raises a question as to the truth of a prevalent opinion, some further notes are added by way of appendix, for the purpose of illustrating the subjects which have appeared worthy of attention. Yet even here conciseness has been attended to; and a reader, instead of finding full information, will sometimes be referred to other works in which it is

afforded. In the notes mention is also made of some peculiarities in the translation. The typographical errors of the original French tract are very numerous, though most of them are only of slight importance, and leave no doubt as to the meaning intended. The points, therefore, alone are noticed which seemed to be of consequence, or with respect to which an historical student might probably wish to exercise his own judgment. The additional notes are followed by an Inquiry into the Authorship of the "Debate between the Heralds" here translated. In this Inquiry the "Debate" itself has been made to render up the name of its author, since there is no external evidence upon the question; and hence this portion of the work naturally comes after the former. There is further added a Conclusion, containing a few remarks on the political subjects suggested rather than discussed in the "Debate," from a point of view embracing a wider range than could be enjoyed by the French author who lived amidst the events which he has described.

For the information necessary to explain the technical passage relating to liturgical ornaments in page 29, I am indebted to the kindness of the Very Reverend Canon Rock, to whom I have much pleasure in acknowledging my obligations.

o





CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
INTRODUCTION	xi
THE DEBATE BETWEEN THE HERALDS OF " FRANCE AND ENGLAND TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH	3
ADDITIONAL NOTES TO THE DEBATE	92
INQUIRY INTO THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE DEBATE	125
CONCLUSION	185





Introduction.

I. THE copy of the French tract entitled "The Debate between the Heralds of France and England," * from which the following translation has been made, is in the library of the British Museum. Brunet, who describes the edition, is of opinion that it was published about the year 1500; my own researches lead to the same conclusion, and no other edition is known. That the work was written by Charles, Duke of Orleans, and finished between the years 1458 and 1461, I shall here assume to have been proved by internal evidence.† More than forty years previously,‡ a debate between the representatives of England and France, regarding the

* *Le Débat des héraux d'armes de France et d'Angleterre.*

† See *An Inquiry into the Authorship of the Debate*, *infra*, p. 125.

‡ A.D. 1416.

importance of their respective kingdoms, had sprung up at the Council of Constance, upon the occasion of a dispute whether England should form a distinct nation in the Council. It seems not improbable that this circumstance may have suggested to Charles of Orleans the idea of composing in its actual form the work now translated.

There is also some reason for believing that the appearance in print of the French "Debate between the Heralds" may have led to the subsequent publication of the Debate at the Council of Constance, which Sir Robert Wingfield, the English ambassador from Henry VIII. to the Emperor Maximilian, first caused to be printed at Louvain, in 1517.* He does not, indeed, allude to the previously published French work, but he states in a preface, that having to attend the Emperor at Constance, he was shown the palace in which the Council had been held; and that, having obtained permission to inspect the records of its proceedings, he found amongst

* This Debate was first published under the title of *Nobilissima Disceptatio super dignitate et magnitudine Regnorum Britanniae et Galliae, habita ab utriusque Oratoribus et Legatis in Concilio Constantinensi*; and it will also be found inserted in the Jesuit Labbé's edition of the Councils; in the Appendix to the Latin edition of Beccatelli's Life of Cardinal Pole, Lond. 1691; and in Von der Hardt's Collections. All four editions of the Debate are very inaccurate, though the last of them is the best.

them the Debate in question, and was so much pleased with it, that he determined to have it published at his expense.

With the exception of Sir Robert Wingfield's publication, we have met with nothing from which it can be inferred that the French "Debate between the Heralds" excited any attention in England until the reign of Edward VI., when a formal reply to it appeared under the following title:—
 "The Debate betwene the Heraldes of Englande and Fraunce, compyled by Iohn Coke, Clarke of the Kynges recognysaunce, or vulgerly called Clarke of the Statutes of the Staple at Westmynster, and fynysht the yere of our Lorde 1550."*

The author thus accounts for the origin of his work:—

I Iohn Coke, Clarke of the recognizaunce of our soueraigne lord the Kyng, or vulgarly called Clarke of the statutes of the Staple of Westmynster, one day in Bruxelles in Brabant, beyng then secretary to the ryght worshypfull and famous company of marchauntes aduenturers of the nacion of Englande, in a prynter's shop chaused to fynde a lyttel pamphlet in Frenche, called the Debate of Heraldes of England and Fraunce, wherein was contayned the comodities in effect of both the sayd realmes, with the victorious actes and prowesses of sondry noble prynces domyniying in tymes past ouer the sayd regyons, whiche after I had perused, perceyuyng the Frenche Heralde wholly (without

* See Dibdin's *Typogr. Antiq.*, iv., p. 238; and his *Bibliomania*, p. 13.

desert) to gyue the honours to Fraunce, and in all thynges dif-famyng this most noble realme and people of England; per-ceyuyng further the sayde boke to be compyled of harty malyce, nothyng ensuyng the true Cronycles of the one realme nor the other: Therfore to the ende that the trueth myght appere to the readers hereof I haue made this small treatyse folowyng, humbly desyryng the readers hereof, that suche defaultes which therin shalbe founde, they woll gently correct, excusyng my ygnorance beyng not lytell, and to haue for agreable this present laboure and worke of the sayde Iohn Coke, whiche perauenture wyll be more than he myght; as sayth Properce, *In magnis voluisse sat est.*

After this comparatively temperate introduction, we might expect to find something like moderation in the pages which follow it, but the perusal of them will prove disappointing. Coke imitates the style of his contemporaries Bale and Ponet, and reviles alike the French nation, the Pope, and the Church of Rome; but possessing neither learning nor discrimination, much of what he writes is trivial and unsatisfactory. He tells us scarcely anything of the recent condition of his country, or of what was going on around him; and, indeed, it would not be easy to point out a publication, claiming to be original, and treating of English life and manners more than three hundred years ago, which is so uninteresting.

In a controversy for superiority between England and France, a French author of the fifteenth

century would naturally be partial to his own country; but we are not compelled to have recourse to an obscure writer, like John Coke, for a reply to the case brought forward by Charles of Orleans, since about the time when the Prince was finishing his work, there was a distinguished English exile residing in France, who has left upon record the result of his experience regarding the condition of the two kingdoms. This was Sir John Fortescue, who had previously been Chief Justice of England, and who, it is not improbable, may have been personally acquainted with the author of the French "Debate."* A considerable part of his treatise entitled "The Difference between an Absolute and a Limited Monarchy,"† consists of a comparison between the free institutions of England and the arbitrary Government of France; and the consequences which he deduces from this opposition of policy, it may be readily imagined, are not in favour of the latter kingdom. In the same author's more

* Fortescue was a statesman as well as a lawyer, and we can trace him at Paris in 1463 or earlier (*Archæolog. Jour.* vii. 171). He had also been a resident in Berry, which is close to Blois, where Charles of Orleans held his Court, though the date of his residence there is uncertain (*De laudibus legum Angliæ*, c. 27). But he may likewise have known the Duke of Orleans in England.

† This treatise was published by the author's descendant, Sir John Fortescue-Aland, in 1714 and 1719: and it is remarkable that of the two biographers of Fortescue, Lord Campbell and Mr. Foss, neither

famous work in commendation of the laws of England, he has treated of the difference between the kingdoms from another point of view ;* and on these two productions taken together, the case of England may safely be left to rest. Indeed, at the present day, the points of discussion raised by the author of the "Debate" here translated are almost removed from the domain of controversy, since the ancient bitterness of national feeling † has so far subsided, that each country is willing to admit the peculiar excellencies of the other.

With regard to the French "Debate" itself, it forms the earliest work which I have met with in my researches amongst the foreign tracts, relating to English affairs, published during the era of the Tudors. The commencement of modern history, after the close of the middle

has noticed its existence, although the work had been commented upon and quoted by our best historians since the time of Hume.

* *De laudibus*, &c, chaps. 29 and 35.

† This feeling, though very strong in ancient times, was in some degree mitigated by the institution of chivalry. In the Imperial Library at Paris, there is a contemporary French tract giving an account of Henry VIII.'s last invasion of France, in 1543 ; but the incident which occupies the chief part of that little volume consists of a tourney, held "for the honour of the ladies," between six English and six French cavaliers, selected from the opposing forces. The tract presents in a pleasing light the courtesy which the contending parties, in spite of the war, mutually observed in their intercourse with each other. The *Chronicle of Calais*, printed for the Camden Society (p. 213), also slightly notices this tourney.

ages, and the origin of printing were contemporaneous. Linked together as the European States then were by the one faith of Christendom, it is not unreasonable to suppose that each would like to know something of the others; and that beyond the accounts which existed only in manuscript, a brief description of passing events in foreign kingdoms would, from the earliest period, occasionally find its way to the press. But amidst the disturbances and neglect of the last four hundred years, many of the oldest publications of this class have perished, while, with respect to those which remain, it seldom happens that more than one or two copies of each can be recovered. I formerly thought of publishing in English a selection of the best of these tracts, which might fall under my notice, and which, as a class, have been overlooked alike by historians and bibliographers.* I found, however, upon

* These tracts having been published as well as written, shortly after the events to which they relate, sometimes serve to point out the origin of popular errors in history. Thus an obscure French tract published at Arras in 1520, and of which only a single copy is known to exist, enabled me some time ago to detect the fact that Henry VIII.'s famous motto, *Cui adhæreo præest*, is a forgery, and to show that the whole story respecting this motto was fabricated by Paulus Jovius (*Notes and Queries*, 3rd series, ii. 262). The old popular notion that there were fifty-two thousand parish churches in England, constitutes the groundwork of the libel by Simon Fish, called *The Supplication of Beggars*, which gave such an impulse to the Reformation in England; and there can be but little doubt that it was derived by him from the

taking the matter in hand, that there was a great difference between making, for my own amusement, a rough translation, in which all the difficulties are slurred over, and ascertaining the meaning of every passage which had been disfigured by the typographical errors so common in these ephemeral publications; and I became apprehensive, that if I attempted to multiply indefinitely the time expended upon the present little work, by including with it others of a similar kind, I might end by doing nothing at all with the subject. If some of my readers should be of opinion that this latter course would have been the most prudent of all, I would observe, that having taken some pains to discover the author of the present tract, I could not make my discovery available without translating and publishing the tract itself. If it be admitted that the authorship of it belongs to Charles, Duke of Orleans, then this fact gives to the anonymous "*Debate between the Heralds*" an historical importance which it would not otherwise

edition of the *Debate at Constance*, published by Sir Robert Wingfield in 1517, and previously mentioned at p. xii. I suspect that the error arose out of the substitution of the numeral letter L, instead of X, in some early manuscript of that work. Again, a passage in the present *Debate between the Heralds*, which is referred to subsequently, goes far to discredit the widely-spread tradition of Henry V.'s declaration, that he would die rather than be taken prisoner at Agincourt. *Infra*, note 20, p. 103.

possess, since he was one of the most accomplished princes, as well as the most elegant poet of his age. But these advantages are slight compared with the special knowledge which he possessed beyond every other of his countrymen, seeing that he resided as an exile in England during a quarter of a century, and thus enjoyed opportunities of becoming intimately acquainted with both kingdoms. Still the present work is intended not so much as a contribution to history, as to point attention to a class of materials for English history which has been neglected. The "Debate" itself, however, possesses two distinct claims to notice. In the first place, it throws fresh light on the social, political, and economical condition of England and France during what is still a very obscure period in our own domestic annals. Its second claim is of a different kind. The most prominent writers of the history of the contest between the two kingdoms in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are Froissard and Monstrelet. In France, under the reign of Louis XIV., it became the fashion to decry these authors; it being alleged that as the former of them was a pensioner of England, and the latter belonged to the Burgundian party, both of them unfairly favoured the English, and were untrustworthy. The tradition of partiality

thus raised influenced even our own historians during the last century. Now, the present "Debate between the Heralds" tends to support the authority of the two early historians, since the admissions made in it, by a witness adverse to England, are of the highest moment. From these it will be seen that, after the territorial struggle with France was over, the shadow of the mighty name of her rival still rested over the land from which the English had been expelled for ever.*

* Machiavelli, in his Remarks on the State of France, written about half a century later, notices the dread which the people in the north of France even then entertained of the English; although, as he justly observes, there was no longer the same reason for it which there had been formerly.



THE
DEBATE BETWEEN THE HERALDS
OF
FRANCE AND ENGLAND.



The Debate between the Heralds of France and England.



AS Prudence was one day diverting herself in a garden, she fell into the company of two heralds, one of whom was the herald of France, and the other of England. So Prudence thought she would ask them a question, in order to find out whether they were learned and skilful in their office; and she began to discourse with them in the following manner:—

“Fair sirs,” said Prudence, “you hold a goodly office, and one which all noblemen ought to love and esteem, since, by means of your reports and information, kings, ladies, princes, and other great lords form their judgment of worldly honours; whether in arms, as in assaults, battles, and sieges, or in jousts and tournaments in high

and stately festivities, and in funeral solemnities. And all things performed on occasions of great magnificence, and relating to honours, ought to be proclaimed and published by you in divers kingdoms and countries, so as to incite many princes and noble knights to undertake great exploits, whereby they may attain to lasting fame and renown. You are also bound to declare the truth in matters of arms, and to dispense honours to those who are entitled to them. With a view, therefore, to pass the time agreeably, as I now see you somewhat at leisure, I will propose to you a question.

“You may,” said Prudence, “have often seen in pictures and tapestries the figure of Honour, admirably represented in great magnificence, and clothed in royal attire, sitting on a rich throne adorned with fine cloth of gold, and having divers crowns on her head, in one hand a globe, and in the other the sword of Honour. On one side are placed the likenesses of Alexander, Julius Cæsar, Judas Maccabeus, David, Charlemagne, Roland, Oliver, and other famous knights, and on the other side are the likenesses of the noble Hector of Troy, King Arthur, Godfrey of Bouillon, and others, representing the persons of the valiant knights who have lived in former days, and on account of whose valour the romances

and chronicles have been made.* All these persons aspire to advance themselves in the presence of Honour, who is thus seated in great magnificence, as I have before mentioned. Therefore, I ask you a question, which is one of general concern: What Christian kingdom is most worthy to be advanced to honour?"†

..

The herald of England suddenly rose up and exclaimed:—"I say, Lady Prudence, that it is the kingdom of England; and that you ought to advance England to honour in preference to every other Christian kingdom, and that there

* Roland is an historical personage, but both he and Oliver are best known as heroes of Romance, who accompanied Charlemagne in his Spanish expedition, and perished at Roncesvalles, where the overthrow of the French host was said to have been brought about by the traitor Ganelon. The eight other personages here mentioned, together with Joshua, the Jewish leader, formed the famous company known as the Nine Worthies; and their names will be easily remembered if it be observed that they comprise three Heathen, three Jews, and three Christians. Our ancient poet Gower thus refers to them in a ballad addressed to Henry the Fourth:

See Alexander, Hector and Julius,

See Machabeus, David and Josue,

See Charleymayne, Godfray and Arthus.

Their exploits are recorded in a once-popular French work, bearing the title of *The Triumph of the Nine Worthies*. This book was evidently a favourite one with the author of the *Debate*, since he several times refers to it in the following pages, and has adopted from it the idea of introducing his own work by personifying Lady Prudence, in imitation of the former, which commences by the personification of Lady Triumph. (See Additional Note 1, p. 92.)

† See Additional Note 2, p. 92.

is no other to be compared to her. This I will prove to you in three ways—by her pleasures, her valour, and her riches.

“With respect to pleasures, Lady Prudence, you must know that there are three things which are the source of great and exquisite pleasure in England—fair ladies, fair chases, and fair sport.

“Concerning fair ladies, I have on my side the proverb,

Qui veult belle dame acquerre,
Preigne visage d’Engleterre.*

And believe me, Lady Prudence, they are the most angelic and lovely faces which it is possible to imagine.

“With regard to fair chases, the kingdom of England is well provided and adorned with them, for it is a fine thing to see what a great number of parks there are, wonderfully full of venison—as of stags, roes, and deer; so that when the ladies go out to divert themselves,† they draw

* There was probably an English equivalent in rhyme for this proverb, but we cannot venture to think that we have recovered it. However, in 1550, John Coke published in English *The Debate between the Heralds of England and France*, which is an answer to the French Debate here translated, and in our own copy of Coke’s work there appears, in a handwriting coeval with the book itself, the following couplet:

He that a fayre Ladye will seke to haue,
Let him beholde the face of Englande brauc.

† See Additional Note 3, p. 93.

their bows and kill these animals, which is a very exquisite pleasure.

“Concerning sport, or, in other words, the pastime of hawking, there can be no comparison; for England is a level country, well cultivated, and not covered with trees or bushes, which might hinder the game from being easily found and caught; and, it has also many partridges, quails, and other birds, as well as hares in great abundance. And with regard to the sport of fowling, no one can imagine a more beautiful country; for there are many little streams which flow into the great rivers, where it is a fine thing, during the season, to see what a profusion there is of wild fowl.*

“Therefore, I say, Lady Prudence, because the kingdom of England is so agreeable and delightful in regard to the pleasures which I have mentioned, you certainly ought to advance that kingdom to honour; for honour well becomes beauty and pleasures, which are things befitting a great nobleman.”

* See Additional Note 4, p. 93.

THE HERALD OF FRANCE.

The herald of France rose up, and with great respect and humility requested Prudence that she would be pleased to give him audience, which she freely granted. He then addressed the herald of England in the following manner:—

“Sir Herald, I wonder what has moved you to speak so forwardly and, as it appears to me, in so proud and uncourtous a manner, since you have begun your discourse without paying any token of respect to Prudence. I also wonder that you should not have invited me to speak, seeing that I am the herald of the greatest of Christian kings,* and who, wherever he may be, takes the right hand in preference to all other kings. I think you have given but little consideration to this matter, as by-and-bye I shall show you. However, I will answer all the articles which you have at present proposed.

“Most high and excellent princess, Lady Prudence, the Cardinal Virtue, I see the herald of England, who attempts to solve the question proposed, and he says he will show that, on account of pleasures, of valour, and of riches, you ought to advance England to honour before every

* See Additional Note 5, p. 94.

other Christian kingdom, and that no other kingdom is to be compared to her ; and he has already spoken of the pleasures in England. To prevent, therefore, the assertions of that herald and my arguments and proofs from being too far apart, and to make the matter more intelligible, I am willing to answer him with respect to pleasure, on which he has now spoken. He shall afterwards speak of valour and riches, and I will answer him, to the best of my ability, on each subject in succession.

“ Sir Herald, you attempt to show Lady Prudence that she ought to advance the kingdom of England to honour before any other Christian kingdom, and you say that you will show this by reason of the great pleasures, valour, and riches which are in the kingdom of England.

“ I say, Lady Prudence, that the English are great boasters, despising every other nation than their own ; and they readily begin wars* which they do not know how to finish. They are likewise so presumptuous that they think their kingdom is of greater valour and dignity than any other Christian kingdom. And in the discussion of this matter you will be fully able to comprehend whether I tell you the truth.

* See Additional Note 6, p. 95.

“You maintain, Sir Herald, that you have three exquisite pleasures in England—fair ladies, fair chases, and fair sport ; and you say,

Qui veult belle dame acquerre,
Preigne visage d’Engleterre.

I answer you, that if there are beautiful ladies in England,* so also there are in France, and very charming. And trust me, Sir Herald, this is a most important matter ; and referring it to Paris, the son of Priam, to decide upon the beauty of the ladies, I will say no more. And with this I take my leave of the subject.

“To what you say, that you have fair chases, and such a wonderful number of parks, all of them full of venison, I answer that to catch an animal in a park is no chase. I say that it is a chase when a wild animal, in a state of nature, is at full liberty to run through woods and forests, and a man by his diligence, with the help of dogs and hounds, forcibly overcomes him. Then are seen the excellence of the dogs, the courage of the hounds, and the perseverance of the man. This, I say, is a real chase, and I call Count Phœbus to witness.† But to catch animals in a

* This sentence is in the original, “Je vous respons q̃ en une dame en engleterre aussi ail en france et de biē gētes ;” and as the text appears to be corrupt, our translation is little better than conjectural.

† This Count Phœbus is Gaston Phœbus, Count de Foix, whose name will be familiar to the readers of Froissard. He was one of the

park is not a chase, since they are caught because they are in the park. It is no wonder, then, if the ladies of England kill them with their bows, since the poor animals must, of necessity, come where they are wanted, and they can only move backwards, and forwards within their parks, so that this ought not to be called a chase. It may be a certain sort of pastime, but it is no chase.

“Sir Herald, you do a fine thing in boasting of the parks in England.* Tell me, I pray, whether you have any parks of such great magnificence as the Bois de Vincennes,† the park of Lusignan,‡ the park of Hesdin,§ and many others

earliest French writers on Hunting and Falconry, and his work has been several times printed.

* See Additional Note 7, p. 96.

† The Bois de Vincennes, near Paris, was enclosed with walls by Philip Augustus in 1183.

‡ The Park at Lusignan, together with the castle built there in the thirteenth century, belonged to the family of that name, which was remarkable in history as enjoying the titular sovereignty of Jerusalem and Cyprus during three centuries. Lusignan is in the department of Vienne, not far from Poitiers.

§ Eustace Deschamps, the French patriotic poet of the fourteenth century, lays the scene of one of his most spirited poems, “Between Beaurain and the Park at Hesdin.” (*Poésies*, p. 71.) The English, during the wars under Edward III., had burned down the house, and laid waste the little property belonging to the poet, and he denounces them with a vehemence which is very natural. The park at Hesdin must have belonged to the castle there, which Edward III. failed to take after the battle of Cressy. Mr. Kirk, in his *History of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy*, gives an ample description of this castle, which belonged to his hero. Sir John Paston also, writing to his brother from

that are to be found in France, which are all called walled parks, being enclosed by high walls, like enclosed towns? These are parks for kings and princes. It is true that you have a great number of parks in England; but with the exception of Windsor park, they are enclosed only by a narrow ditch, a hedge, or palings, like the vineyards and pasture-grounds of France; and, indeed, they are merely village parks, so that there was no occasion for making such great boast about them.

“I say, Sir Herald, that we have not only all the wild animals which you have, as stags, roes, and deer, but we have many other animals for the chase besides these; for we have wild boars, or wild black swine, and we have also wolves and foxes, while you have none.* And you must know that these are bloodthirsty animals, so that it requires persons of great courage to overcome them. Thus it appears from what I have mentioned that we have fairer and pleasanter chases than you have, since we have all that you possess, and much more.

Calais in 1477 (Paston *Letters*, Knight's ed., ii. 113), speaks of the castle of Hesdin as then being “one of the royalest castles of the world.” The present town of Hesdin, in the department of Pas-de-Calais, is built at some distance from the ancient town, which was destroyed in 1553.

* See Additional Note 8, p. 97.

“Sir Herald, you boast of the fair sport which you have, whether the game be birds or hares. And we also have more; for we have great red-legged or Grecian partridges,* and we have likewise pheasants† in great abundance, while you have none, and, believe me, these are delicious birds, fit for the palate of kings and princes. We have also goshawks and tercelet,‡ which are bred in the kingdom of France, and are necessary for the sport and pastime of hawking; but you have none, except such as may be brought to you from foreign kingdoms. Therefore, with respect neither to the pleasure of the chase nor of sport do you at all approach the kingdom of France.

“Now proceed to say what you please concerning valour, and I will answer it all to the best of my ability.”

* See Additional Note 9, p. 97.

† See Additional Note 10, p. 98.

‡ See Additional Note 11, p. 98.

THE HERALD OF ENGLAND SPEAKS OF VALOUR.

“Lady Prudence, I say, that for valour, you ought to advance the kingdom of England to honour before all other Christian kingdoms. This I will prove to you by the valiant deeds done in times past, as well as in the middle times said to be within the memory of man, and also at the present time.

Of Times Past.

“Lady Prudence, you know that the Emperor Constantine sprang from this noble kingdom of England, and that the Romans sent even into England to seek for him; and he reigned in great honour and authority as universal emperor. Maximian,* who was so worthy a knight, and who conquered the Gauls and the Lombards, was a native of the kingdom of England. So also was King Arthur,† who was personally so valiant and so great a conqueror that by reason of his great exploits he is in the number of the

* The Emperor Constantine the Great, and the Emperor Maximus, whom the chronicles call Maximian, were long regarded as English worthies. It is now generally admitted that neither of them was born in Britain.

† See Additional Note 12, p. 99.

Nine Worthies. He also in his time accomplished a work of the highest honour, in making the Round Table, at which were assembled those valiant knights who performed so many noble actions that the romances of them even now are all over the world, and the memory of them will be everlasting. Thus, it appears, that in times past the men of valour have come from England, and that no kingdom can or ought to be compared to England, which ought to be advanced to honour before every other.

Of the Middle Times.

“ We will now speak of the middle times, said to be within the memory of man. It is very certain that France, which was anciently called Gaul, is one of the most powerful nations of Christendom. Let us look then at the battles which the English have gained over the French within the memory of man: the great battle of Cressy, which was won by the English; the battle of Poitiers, in which King John of France was taken prisoner and afterwards carried into England by the English; and, within recent memory, the great and famous battle of Agincourt, in which there perished so many of the nobility, and so many of the great lords of the royal

blood of France were taken prisoners; the battle of Verneuil,* and many others, all of which were won by the English.

“Therefore I say, Lady Prudence, that a kingdom producing such valiant warriors ought to be esteemed; and since they have been thus victorious over the most powerful nation of Christendom, they ought to be highly esteemed and advanced to honour.

Of the Present Time.

“Let us now speak of the present time. The kingdom of England is not so extensive as the kingdom of France; and yet the English are at war with the King of France, the King of Spain, the King of Denmark, and the King of Scotland, which latter country is within the same island as England; and thus they are at war with four

* Verneuil, on the frontiers of Normandy, is in the department of the Eure. The battle fought there in 1424 closes the list of great victories won in France by the English under the princes of the Plantagenet family. John, Duke of Bedford, Regent of France, commanded the English on that occasion, and the army opposed to him was composed of French and Scots in about equal proportion, and not greatly superior in number to his own. The battle was obstinately contested, and cost the English sixteen hundred men, but their victory was complete. An excellent description of this battle is given by Wavrin du Forestel, who was present at it in the retinue of the Earl of Salisbury. (*Anchiennes Croniques d'Engleterre*, i. 262.)

kings.* They are also at deadly war with the Irish ; and, in sailing from England to Ireland, the opposite coasts are almost visible from each other. Yet, nevertheless, Lady Prudence, they find the means of carrying on all these wars, and there is no other kingdom than England which could support such a burden.† Hence may very plainly be seen the power of the kingdom of England and the great valour of the English, who are able to encounter so many kings.

“ Besides, they are more richly and amply provided at sea with fine and powerful ships than any other nation of Christendom, so that they are kings of the sea, since none can resist them ; and they who are strongest on the sea may call themselves kings.

“ Thus, for the reasons mentioned, Lady Prudence, it is plain, that in regard alike to past times, to the middle times, and to the present, your question is solved, and that you ought to advance the kingdom of England to honour.”

* During the latter years of the reign of Henry VI., within which period the text was written, the relations of England with foreign Powers were in a very satisfactory condition, and the four wars referred to were of long standing. It appears from the *Fœdera*, however, that a truce for four years with Scotland was concluded in July 1459, and after the accession of Edward IV. treaties of peace were made with France, Denmark, and Spain.

† See Additional Note 13, p. 99.

THE HERALD OF FRANCE ANSWERS
WITH RESPECT TO VALOUR.

“ Sir Herald, you say that the Emperor Constantine, the valiant knight Maximian, and the mighty and valiant King Arthur, who all performed such wonderful exploits in their time, were natives of the kingdom of England, and that on this account England ought to be held in perpetual honour.

“ To this I answer, that it is necessary, in the first place, to consider from whence these noble knights mentioned by you came and were derived. Believe me, Lady Prudence, if it be your pleasure to be informed, they were descendants of the great nobility of Troy ; and after the destruction of Troy, a valiant Trojan knight, named Æneas, accompanied by many noblemen, came to the country of Rome, and from him afterwards descended a knight, called Brutus. This Brutus landed with a strong force in the island of Albion, which is at present called England, and fought with many giants who were in that island, and in the end he conquered the island, destroyed the giants, and peopled the country with his own followers. He likewise willed and ordained, because his name was Brutus, that the island should

be called Britain, instead of Albion. And what the herald of England has spoken of applies to this Brutus and his race. •

“ Now, Lady Prudence, let us see from whence the English are sprung, and why the island formerly called Britain is now called England. You will find, if you please to enquire, that they came from the land of Saxony, which is a country in Germany. It is very true that, in consequence of divisions which broke out amongst the Britons, the Saxons were invited to come over and make war in Britain; and they carried on very great wars there. Afterwards they resolved, by certain subtle means, and with the aid of a man called Gormond, to set up pretensions that the kingdom of England belonged to them, which the Britons resisted for a very long time. This Gormond was the son of a king, but did not choose to succeed to the kingdom, for he said that no one was worthy to have a kingdom who was not able to conquer it; so he went away triumphing through the world, and came to the aid of the Saxons, and by his means they destroyed the Britons and drove them out of their country. Gormond afterwards passed over into Gaul, and gave his conquest to the Saxons. And because there was a Saxon named Inglus, who had begun the war in times past, before the

arrival of Gormond, all the Saxons agreed that the island which was called Britain should take the name of Inglus, and be called England. In this way it took its name ; and thus these things are related in the book called 'The Brut.* And

* *The Brut* is a poem written in French by Robert Wace, an Anglo-Norman poet of the twelfth century, and it is chiefly founded upon the pretended British history composed by Geoffrey of Monmouth. This history commences with the arrival in Britain of Brutus, the great-grandson of Æneas, and ends in the year A.D. 688, with the death of Cadwallader, and the settlement of the Saxons in England. As Geoffrey of Monmouth lived in the twelfth century, or about five hundred years after the latest of the events described, he professes to have translated his work, which is Latin, from an ancient chronicle in the British language. The great fact which is opposed to its authenticity is, that the whole performance is pervaded from first to last by ideas which could only have come into existence after the establishment of the feudal system in Europe ; and it presupposes throughout the fully-developed action of that system upon events, which, if they ever happened at all, must have taken place many centuries before feudalism was known. In spite of this, however, Geoffrey has composed his narrative with wonderful skill, to have imposed upon the credulity of his own age and the ages which succeeded him, so that during several centuries his fictions formed the basis of the popular histories of England. Shakespeare also is indebted to the same source of fiction, and found there the original of King Lear and his daughters. The author, who was Bishop of St. Asaph, seems to have written his work for the purpose of extolling the ancient British, who in his time were settled in Wales, Cornwall, and Armorica. There is not a word in his book, unsupported by other authority, which can be relied upon as truth ; although, as a presumed veracious history, which our forefathers, and the French as well, believed in during several centuries, it is by no means to be despised, since it has powerfully influenced the English race. Even Sir John Fortescue, Chief Justice of England, who was a contemporary of the author of the *Debate*, refers to Brutus as an historical character (*Abs. and Lim. Monarchy*, p. 12).

The original French version of Wace's *Brut* was published at Rouen in 1836-8. Sir F. Madden has since published Layamon's semi-Saxon paraphrase of the same poem, together with an English translation.

the Saxons did this honour to Inglus a long time after his death.

“Now let us see, Lady Prudence, how greatly the herald of England is mistaken and unfaithful in his office; for he would fain cover and adorn himself with another man’s robe, and would attribute the honour of the before-mentioned knights, who were of the nation of Britain, to the nation of Saxony, which is at present called England. A greater reproach or dishonour cannot be charged against a knight than that of attributing to himself the honour and valour due to another. And you have already said, Lady Prudence, that we heralds ought to dispense honours to those who are entitled to them.

“Therefore, Sir Herald, do not bring forward the exploits of those knights, for you have no right to proclaim or mention the valiant and honourable deeds which they performed in their time, and which ought to be ascribed to the honour of the nation of Britain, from whence they sprung, and not to the renown of the English.

“But tell me, Sir Herald, and inform Lady Prudence, of the great exploits and wars of magnificence which the English, otherwise called the Saxons, have engaged in since the succession to the island of Britain devolved upon the race of

the Saxons, by way of donation from the before-mentioned Gormond. For my part, I have neither known nor read that they have ever made war, except among themselves (which the Romans call civil war), or against their neighbours; and in these respects they have abundant experience. And they readily begin wars which they do not know how to finish, as I shall hereafter show. It is true, indeed, that a king of England, called Richard, Duke of Normandy, in discharge of the feudal obligation belonging to his fief of Normandy, accompanied King Philip of France in his expedition against the Saracens, but he did not remain with him long;* nor is the matter of

* This is literally true, although in a contrary sense to what the author intended to convey to his readers. Richard the Lion-hearted did not remain long with the King of France, because the latter abandoned the army of the crusaders. Joinville, the friend of St. Louis, and whose authority on this matter is unimpeachable, says: "After Acre was taken, King Philip returned to France, for which he was much blamed. King Richard remained behind in the Holy Land, where he performed such high exploits, that the Saracens were in great dread of him; as it appears, in the Book of the Holy Land, that when the Saracen children cried, the women, in order to keep them still, called to them and said, 'Be quiet; here is King Richard coming'; and the Saracens and Bedouins, when their horses started at a bush, said to their horses, 'Do you think you see King Richard?'" (c. 17). As the author has chosen to raise the question in the text, we may here mention another circumstance related by Joinville. Richard, as he marched forward with the English, in the confident expectation of capturing Jerusalem, was called by one of his soldiers to view from an eminence the city, which then first appeared in sight, at the moment when he had received intelligence that the French, who ought to have followed him, were turning back. The King thereupon drew his banner before his

much consequence, since the case is not one that has often happened.

“You must know, Sir Herald, that I make a great distinction between common war and war of great magnificence. For I say that common war is either domestic, or against neighbours and kinsmen; and war of magnificence is when princes proceed at the head of their feudal vassals to make conquest* in distant and foreign countries, or to fight for the defence or extension of the Catholic faith.

“I shall now, therefore, Lady Prudence, under your good correction, speak of the valour of France in times past. Clovis, king of France, was the first Christian king, which I account a great honour.† And one day, when he was fighting against the Saracens, his shield, charged with the fleurs-de-lis, was brought to him from heaven, and he won the battle. The sacred ampulla,‡

face, in order to intercept the view, and bursting into tears, he exclaimed, “Ah, Lord God! let me not, I beseech thee, behold thy holy city, since I cannot deliver it out of the power of thine enemies” (c. 108). Gibbon, in his *Decline and Fall* (ch. 59), refers to these statements by Joinville, and gives a summary of Richard’s exploits.

* See Additional Note 14, p. 100.

† See Additional Note 15, p. 100.

‡ The *ampulla* was the phial containing the holy oil with which the kings of France were anointed at their coronation. It was broken to pieces and destroyed in 1793 by the revolutionists at Rheims. The English Church, in the fifteenth century, not wishing to be outdone, produced at the coronation of Henry IV. their ampulla also, an account of

from which the kings of France are anointed, was sent to St. Remi by an angel from heaven, and is preserved in the abbey of St. Remi at Rheims. The sacred banner of the Oriflamme* was also sent to Clovis from heaven. Because God showed him so much honour, we, who are in this world and mortal men, are surely bound to pay honour to him, and to all his posterity and race. Charles Martel, king of France, defeated the Saracens near Poitiers, and gained over them a great battle, in which they numbered 385,000 combatants.† The same king, Charles, afterwards marched into Languedoc, to raise the siege which the Saracens were carrying on before the city of Carcassonne, and he gained the battle, and over-

which will be found in the old chronicles, in Sir John Hayward's *Life and Reign of King Henry IV.* and also in Rapin's *History of England*. Juvenal des Ursins, Archbishop of Rheims, the historian of the reign of Charles VI., and who would naturally be interested in the more ancient relic, describes Henry's coronation, but does not venture to say that the English ampulla was a counterfeit, though it is not very difficult to discover that he thought so.

* The *Oriflamme* was the famous banner of France, the ground of which was red, strewed over with flames of gold. It was, in fact, the ancient banner of the abbey of St. Denis, and did not belong to the kings of France until towards the end of the eleventh century. The oriflamme was displayed for the last time at the battle of Agincourt in 1415.

† This exaggerated estimate is derived from the chroniclers, and may be partly accounted for by the fleetness of the Arab cavalry, whose frequent and rapid incursions would have the effect of apparently multiplying their numbers.

came three Saracen kings, and killed and took prisoner a marvellous number of the infidels.

“The Pope was driven out of Rome, and lost the patrimony of the Church. Pepin, king of France, came to his assistance, and brought him back to Rome, placed him in his see, and made King Astolfo tributary to him. The son of Pepin was Charlemagne, who was so noble a king, and performed such great acts of valour, especially against the Saracens; and he brought over all the Spains to the Catholic faith, and conquered many lordships, both in Germany and Lombardy. He likewise restored at another time Pope Adrian to his see, and overthrew King Desiderius of Lombardy, the enemy of the Pope and of the Romans. Also he recovered all the patrimony of the Church, and restored it to the Pope, and gave him what belonged to himself; as Master Brunet, a Latin writer, relates in his work called the ‘Treasure of Sapience.’ Indeed, it is said in the book called the ‘Dream of the Orchard,’* that the kings of France have nine times restored the Pope to his see of

* The books here referred to existed only in manuscript at the time when the present tract was written. Brunet, the Bibliographer, records two printed editions of the Italian translation of the *Treasure of Sapience* (*Trésor de Sapience*), which work he says was first written in French in the thirteenth century (i. 222). *The Dream of the Orchard* (*Le Songe du Vergier*) was written in the fourteenth century, and there are several printed editions of the work (Brunet, iii 247.) Charles de Louviers is stated to be the author. See Additional Note 16, p. 100.

Rome. 'The same Charlemagne was afterwards emperor, and you yourselves in England were subject to him;* and for his great acts of valour

* This assertion and the subsequent one which the author makes, that Charlemagne conquered England, are not to be altogether disregarded. The subjection of England to Charlemagne, and subsequently to the Empire of Germany, it need scarcely be added, never had any foundation in fact; but there was at the commencement of the fifteenth century a vague tradition on the subject sufficient to exonerate the French herald from the charge of inventing the statement in the text. We do not now allude so much to the shadowy supremacy of the German Empire over all Christian kingdoms, derived from the ancient Roman Empire, as to the special circumstances relating to England. The tradition that Charlemagne conquered England does not appear to have arisen until long after his decease, since it is not alluded to by Eginhard, in Turpin's *Chronicle*, or in the narrative of the Emperor's exploits contained in the *Triumph of the Nine Worthies*. It probably arose from the use of the equivocal word *Britannia*, which might mean either Great Britain, or the province of Brittany in France. Several instances where a mistake might have occurred, and originated the tradition, will be found in Dom Bouquet's Collection of the old Historians of France. Thus, for instance, under the year 799, and therefore during the reign of Charlemagne, it is stated (vol. v. p. 130, c.) "Itaque Britannia [i. e. Brittany] tunc primum Francis subjugata est." This is sufficient to show that the French herald might fairly have been mistaken.

Roger de Hoveden expressly says (*Rer. Anglicar. Scriptores*, p. 724) that Richard the Lion-hearted, before he was suffered to quit Germany in 1193, did homage for the kingdom of England to the Emperor Henry IV., and the memory of this circumstance may possibly have given rise to the strange incident which occurred in 1416. In that year the Emperor Sigismund, with a train of one thousand persons, visited England, and just as he was on the point of landing at Dover, the Duke of Gloucester, accompanied by several English noblemen, rushed into the water with their drawn swords, and accosting the Emperor, informed him that if he challenged any sovereign power in England, they would oppose his entry into the kingdom. The Emperor graciously satisfied their minds upon this point, and was then welcomed with acclamation. This incident shows that, although the Emperor's authority in England would not have been allowed, there was a suspicion that it might have been claimed.

he is placed in the number of the Nine Worthies. Roland and Oliver,* who performed so many valiant and memorable actions against the Saracens, were Frenchmen. Godfrey of Bouillon,† who conquered Jerusalem, and is one of the Nine Worthies, was a native of France, and Count of Boulogne-sur-mer. These are what I call wars of great magnificence and honour, and which well deserve to be related, and to form the subject of chronicles; and they are not wars compelled by necessity. I pass lightly over the common wars which the French have made against the Germans and their other neighbours, and which it would be tedious to relate; since in the romances and chronicles there are wonderful accounts of them, and such common wars are not to be mentioned or chronicled with wars of magnificence. ‡

“If in times past, Sir Herald, your kings of England have made wars of magnificence, you would do well to give an account of them, in order that you may receive an answer. Nevertheless, I warn you, for your chronicles do not mention that either you or your predecessors have

* See note, *supra*, p. 5.

† Godfrey of Bouillon, the principal hero of the first crusade, and of the celebrated poem of Tasso, the *Jerusalem Delivered*.

‡ See Additional Note 17, p. 101.

ever made a war of magnificence by sea or land.

“From what I have already said, you may see, Lady Prudence, that the kings of France have always been perfect in the law without swerving from it, and that they have extended Christianity and defended the rights of holy Church. Therefore, the Saracens, and also all the other infidels, say that the King of France is the great king of the Christians, and no other can be so called. And now I address my speech to the herald of England.

“You know, Sir Herald, it was not long ago that for your misdoings you wore the maniple, otherwise called the gonfanon, sewn behind the left shoulder in the middle of the alb, with a difference from other Christians. Perhaps during the last schism which was in holy Church, you pestered so much the anti-Pope,* whom you had faith in, that he granted you a dispensation, and ordained for the future that the maniple should not be put in albs to be afterwards made, but that it should remain in those already made until they were worn out. I say this because I, who am speaking, have been in England; and in the

* Whenever there was a schism in the Church, the English and the French always took opposite sides, and hence each nation called the Pope obeyed by the other the anti-Pope.

ancient abbeys, where the vestments of holy Church are honourably preserved, I have seen the maniple behind, in the form and manner which I have described, and as it has been from all antiquity. Therefore, Sir Herald, do not think that by reason of any dispensation which you may have had from your Pope, the disgrace can be blotted out; for it is written in so many books and chronicles, that the matter cannot be hid, and however much you may think to efface it by means of such a dispensation, and cause it to be forgotten, it is a shame and reproach to you.*

* The Very Rev. Canon Rock, to whom the editor is indebted for the explanation of this passage, states that the word *maniple* in the text (orig. *le manipulum*) ought to have been *apparel*; and that the author, by wrongly substituting the one word for the other, proves himself to have been a layman. Canon Rock adds:—

“The fact is this; in olden times, all albs in England had six apparels sewed to them—one on each cuff; one before; one behind, below; one on the shoulder, one on the breast. The one on the shoulder had a form to make it two-tongued as it were, in token that this island had been *twice* brought to the faith—once under the Britons, once under the Anglo-Saxons; and this two-tongued apparel was an English singularity in liturgical ornaments, and as such noticeable to strangers. To tease Englishmen foreigners argued—to be twice converted showed that once at least England must have fallen away from the truth, and become heretic. This the English denied; and no doubt the Frenchman in the dialogue [in the text], to be smart upon the Englishman at the time, twitted him with his supposed national defection from the Church.

“John of Ypres, abbot of St. Bertin, who died A.D. 1383, speaks of this English apparel on the alb” (*Novus Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, t. iii. p. 450, ed. Martene).

Canon Rock further refers to his own *Church of our Fathers*, t. i. pp. 430, 448, for an explanation of the subject.

“King John of England greatly persecuted and outraged holy Church, insomuch that the Pope excommunicated him, and put the whole kingdom of England under a general interdict ; and the King was so obstinate and disobedient that he would not repent or humble himself to the Pope, until the latter declared him unworthy of the crown, and gave his kingdom for a conquest to the then reigning King of France. Your King, seeing that the King of France was resolved to bring him to reason, sent to the Pope, and threw himself and his whole kingdom upon the Pope’s mercy ; and the Pope sent thither his legate, called Pandulph, to whom, as representing the person of the Pope, King John made such great and abject submission that, from respect for the royal dignity, I am ashamed to declare it.* Consult your chronicles upon this point, and you will think worse of yourself. Mention might also be made, if it were necessary, of Pope Agnes, who deceived the Church, and who is commonly reported to have been a native of England ; but I have never met with the fact in history.†

* See Additional Note 18, p. 102.

† The existence of this fabulous Pope, called Agnes, or Joan, was commonly believed in the fifteenth century. The testimony of various authors on the subject is collected in Bayle’s *Historical Dictionary*. The subject has also been recently treated by Mr. Baring-Gould, in his *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages*.

“The King of France may call himself a free king, for he does not hold the temporalities of his kingdom under any superior. Therefore, he may be represented as carrying in his left hand a globe denoting his kingdom, and in his right hand a sword to defend the same. But you hold by compact of the See of Rome, and are tributary to it in the yearly sum of a thousand silver marks; and this does not include the Peter pence, which is a penny sterling for every hearth and a rent of base tenure; as these things appear by the testimony of your chronicles, in the chapter of the reign of King John.* What I relate, Sir Herald, is not spoken to affront or provoke you, but I say it in order to remind you of what is

* Dodd, in his *Church History of England*, says, the Peter pence “was an annual tax or gift first bestowed upon the See of Rome by Ina, King of the West Saxons, about 720, and so continued under the monarchies of the Saxons, Danes and Normans till 1532; that it was refused by King Henry VIII. upon his breach with the Holy See. It was granted at first for the subsisting of the English that travelled to Rome, where a college or house of entertainment with lands, &c., was built for that purpose, and continued as a perpetual remembrance of the English nation for the many favours received from Rome, especially of their conversion from idolatry” (i. 385). It would appear, however, that the payment of Peter pence was liable to be suspended, since Caxton states, under the year 1364, “This year was ordained that Peter pence from thenceforth should not be paid, which of old time was granted for continuing of school in Rome” (see the last book of “*Polychronicon*” reprinted by Mr. Blaydes in his *Life and Typography of Caxton*). The tax was finally abolished by the “Act concerning Peter pence and Dispensations,” passed in 1533. There never was any pretence for affirming that the Peter pence was a rent of base tenure, or implied a submission derogatory to the sovereignty of England.

contained in your chronicles, and that you may not be so outrageous in your assertions; for you have said that no one is to be compared to you. This is language which it is more becoming to leave unsaid than to utter. And, thank God, the French have never wavered in the faith, and there is no blemish in their practice, and they are neither tributary nor accountable to anyone.

“Hence, Lady Prudence, it appears very plainly that the herald of England says nothing which should induce you to advance the kingdom of England to honour on account of the deeds done in times past, but you ought to decide in my favour for the honour of France; and because he would attribute to the nation of Saxony, at present called England, the honour due to others, you ought to give judgment against him, to his great dishonour and reproach.

Of the Times within the Memory of Man.

“Now, let us speak of the middle times, which are said to be within the memory of man, and I will answer the arguments alleged by the herald of England. He says that France, which was anciently called Gaul, is one of the most powerful nations of Christendom; and in this respect

he speaks the truth. Then he says that the English have gained many battles against the French, and are therefore to be greatly esteemed; and he names these battles, and is vain-glorious about them, and very anxious to cast reproach upon France. To this I answer, Lady Prudence, that God orders and disposes of battles, punishes kings for their sins, makes them lose battles, and sends them famines and persecutions; because, says Boetius, ‘If anyone uses power badly, power afterwards uses him worse, even by God’s permission.’* Also God sometimes punishes the people for disobedience to their king. In this world, however, Sir Herald, it is no reproach to a king if he lose a battle. On the contrary, it is greatly to his honour to have fought it out resolutely. I mean, when he stands fast, and is either killed or taken prisoner; but if he abandon his people, he ought to be visited with reproach. Hannibal the Carthaginian gained three or four great battles against the Romans, insomuch that he came to the gates of Rome; yet the Romans took courage, notwithstanding the loss of these battles, and sent to Carthage Scipio Africanus, who made war so vigorously that Hannibal was obliged to return to Carthage, and he was killed

* See Additional Note 19, p. 102.

in battle,* and Carthage was destroyed by the Romans. Thus they fully revenged themselves for the battles which they had lost, and which were regarded as redounding to their honour, and not to their reproach. The valiant prince Julius Cæsar, who is in the number of the Worthies, upon his landing in Britain, which is at present called England, was twice defeated, as the 'Brut'† relates; but in the third instance he overcame the Britons, and brought them under subjection to Rome. If the loss of a battle were a reproach, Julius Cæsar would not have been placed in the number of the Worthies. The valiant knight Duguesclin, Constable of France, lost the battle of Auray,‡ and also the battle of Naxera, in Spain, and yet he performed so many valiant exploits against you and others that he is placed by France in the number of the Worthies.§ If

* There is no authority for this statement that Hannibal was killed in battle, as he is believed to have perished by his own hand in Bithynia.

† See Note, *supra*, p. 20.

‡ The battle of Auray, near Vannes in Brittany, was fought in 1364, and that of Naxera, in Spain, in 1367. Both battles were won by the English, and in each of them, by a singular coincidence, the celebrated Constable was taken prisoner by Sir John Chandos, who on the former occasion exacted a hundred thousand francs for his ransom. The spirited description given by Froissard of the battle of Auray was derived by him from the herald who was present at it, and who carried home to England the tidings of the victory.

§ Towards the end of the fourteenth century an account of the exploits of Bertrand Duguesclin was added as a supplement to the ancient popular French work, *The Triumph of the Nine Worthies*; and he

a lost battle were a reproach, he would not have received such an honour. Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, lost divers battles against the English before fortune returned to him, but he was so victorious in the end that he expelled all the English from his kingdom. You also say that the English have many times offered battle to the kings of France, who have not dared to fight, and that this is a shame and reproach to them; yet you admit they often have fought with you. If they have lost the battles, this is no reproach, but ought to be accounted a great honour to them. With respect to the battle of Poitiers, King John gained marvellous great honour by it, for he was in his own kingdom and country, and might very well have retreated if he had so chosen; but he preferred rather to die or be taken prisoner,* and he awaited the fortune of the battle, which ought to redound very greatly to his honour.† And you will find that

thus came to be regarded in France as a tenth worthy. (See Note, *supra*, p. 5.) Brunet, under the word 'Neuf,' notices several printed editions of the *Triumph of the Nine Worthies*.

* See Additional Note 20, p. 103.

† King John, though an honourable and brave cavalier, was deficient in the higher order of courage, or he would not have signed the Treaty of Bretigny; and Philip de Comines, who was quite ready to make all fair allowances for kings, has held up to reprobation his conduct in thus sacrificing the welfare of his people to procure his own release from captivity. His son, Charles the Wise, gained much more honour by

the kings and lords of the royal blood of France have never abandoned their people in battle.

“ I answer you, Sir Herald, in another way. You talk, indeed, of the battles which you say that you have gained, and you give the names of them ; but you say nothing of the great number of battles which you have fought and lost in this kingdom of France. These I do not intend to recount, but I refer you for them to the chronicles. Yet I will allege to you a weighty argument which cannot be controverted. Within the memory of man the kings of England were lords of the duchies of Normandy and Guienne, as well as counts of Anjou, Maine, Touraine, and Poictou ; and because you would not obey the King of France, of whom these lordships are held, Philip the Fortunate, King of France, for your felony, rebellion, and disobedience, thrust you out of almost all these provinces, and conquered them from you by battles, sieges, and other means, and reduced them as forfeited lands into his own possession.

“ Thus you may see, Lady Prudence, that in the middle times, otherwise said to be within the memory of man, whatever wars there may have been between the French and the English, and

employing the talents of Duguesclin, and redressing the evils of the state.

whatéver battles may have been gained on either side, victory and conquest have accrued to the French, and loss to the English. It necessarily happens that there are losses and gains in war ; for if one side always prevailed, the war would soon be over and finished, which would not be to the profit of the office of the English herald or myself. It is seen in the end which side has the advantage. “

“ Within the memory of man the Saxons, otherwise called the English, have never conquered the kingdom of France, although they have frequently made the attempt ; but so often as they have invaded it, unless they returned home speedily and in good time, truly it has proved to be their grave. I say the burden has fallen upon their own shoulders, and to their great reproach they have been repulsed. But it is well known that the French have several times conquered England. Charlemagne, King of France, conquered England, and the English were his subjects.* William of Normandy conquered them, and made himself king of England. Louis, son of the King of France, expelled King John of England from Guienne, and afterwards pursued him into England, where he made such extensive conquests, and carried on such fierce

* See Note, *supra*, p. 26.

war, that if it had not been for the Pope, who then reigned and disposed of the realm, he would have made himself king of England.*

“ I will show you, Sir Herald, that within a short time afterwards there was a lady who conquered England, and this is how it happened. Isabella, daughter of the King of France, was united in marriage to King Edward of Carnarvon, and by this marriage there was born a son called Edward of Windsor. King Edward of Carnarvon, being badly advised, as the chronicle says, sent his son into France to do homage for the duchy of Guienne, where the latter was honourably received, and made Duke of Guienne. The queen and her son lived for some time in Guienne, contrary to the will and consent of King Edward of Carnarvon, who looked upon them as his enemies. And when the queen saw that this was the case, she collected Frenchmen and Hainaulters, all of them men of great

* Louis, the eldest son of Philip, King of France, was invited over to England by the English barons, during their contest with King John, after they had compelled their sovereign to sign Magna Charta, and he had brought a mercenary army into the kingdom, for the purpose of enabling him to abolish that law. Louis was proclaimed king by the barons of his party, but never had undisputed possession of the government, and not long afterwards King John fortunately died. Henry III., the son of John, succeeded to the throne without difficulty, and Louis with his followers was obliged to return to France. The Pope, it is true, took part against Louis; but independently of this interference, the position of the French prince had become untenable.

courage, and she and her son departed with a great force into England, and she acted so valiantly and wisely that she caused her husband, Edward of Carnarvon, to be taken and imprisoned, and had her son Edward of Windsor crowned in the lifetime of his father. Thus the queen showed plainly that by conquest she was the mistress, and her son king; and that she conquered England in opposition to her husband. To this effect your chronicles bear witness, in the chapter of King Edward of Carnarvon. And King Edward of Windsor, at the age of fourteen years, caused himself to be crowned in the lifetime of his father, and afterwards he went to Amiens to do homage for the duchy of Guienne, to his uncle the King of France.*

“Therefore, I say, Lady Prudence, that the herald of England speaks nothing of the middle times, said to be within the memory of man, which makes much for his purpose; and that for the reasons before mentioned, it behoves you to decide that the kingdom of France ought to be advanced to honour, and that my facts and arguments are most evident.”

* The shameless and unnatural conduct, as a wife and mother, exhibited by Isabella of France, the consort of Edward II., is too well known to require comment:

“She-wolf of France, with unrelenting fangs,
That tear’st the bowels of thy mangled mate!”

Of the Present Time.

“ Let us now speak of the present time, Sir Herald. You do wonders in lauding your kingdom of England, and you boast of being at war with the four kings whom you have mentioned, and at deadly war with the Irish ; and you say further that you are king of the sea. I answer you, and will show that your boasts ought to be retorted upon you with reproach, shame, and dishonour. Therefore let us first take the King of Scotland. You maintain and say that the King of Scotland ought to be your liege man and subject, and ought to come to your parliament when he is summoned. The King of Scotland says that he is as much a king in his kingdom as you are in yours, and that he is in no respect your servant or subject, and that he is not within England, which was formerly called Britain. There is no arm of the sea, no mountain or great river by means of which an easy entrance from one kingdom into the other is prevented ; and also it is true that your kingdom of England is superior in wealth, in good towns, and in the great number of its people to the kingdom of Scotland. Yet you are unable to find the means of subduing the Scots, and bringing them under your authority. But the King

of Scotland is the true possessor, well obeyed by all his subjects; and when you make war against him he is well able to resist you, and to make you lose more than you gain. Therefore it must be said that honour belongs to the King of Scotland and his subjects, and that shame remains with you; for he knows better how to defend himself than you know how to attack him, and he maintains his independence. Thus you have no reason to boast of that war.

“ With respect to the case of the Irish, you derive but little honour from it, for in your title you call yourself *Rex Angliæ, Dominus Hiberniæ*, that is, King of England, Lord of Ireland; and thus you maintain that Ireland is your lawful domain and inheritance.* Ireland is a country not within the island of England, but the sea between the two is not much wider than can be seen across; and it is very true that you possess several towns and castles there, and that you have dominion over certain districts, but it is not a tenth part of the island of Ireland which submits to you. That island is very extensive: as large, indeed, or larger than all England and Scotland.† The inhabitants have no

* Henry VIII. was the first English sovereign who assumed the title of King of Ireland; and this title is recognised by an Act of Parliament passed in the thirty-fifth year of his reign.

† Giraldus Cambrensis, and other writers on the topography of

great store of clothing or armour to make war-like resistance, and they are called the *wild Irish*, because they do not employ themselves in agriculture, but subsist entirely upon their cattle, and are but little civilised. You say that they are rebellious and disobedient to you, and yet you cannot find the means of bringing them into subjection, or of making your sovereignty available. Hence it must be said that honour is due to the poor Irish, who are even a much greater reproach to you, and proof of your folly, than the Scots. Thus your boasts are in contradiction to your deeds, which are shown to be very small.

“You say that you are at war with the Kings of Spain and Denmark. I answer that I fully believe you hate them; but it is a war of words which has no result, for you possess nothing in the kingdom of Spain or of Denmark. It may be that when you are able you make war at sea against the merchants of those countries, and that you obstruct the utility of commerce. Therefore you have no business to make any great

Ireland, ought to have prevented our author from falling into this error; but strange language respecting the extent of Ireland was spoken by the English at the Council of Constance, A.D. 1416, in their famous debate with the French. Manuscript accounts of this debate soon got abroad, and we suspect that to one of them we owe the statement in the text. Richard of Cirencester also quotes Agrippa as stating that Ireland (Hibernia) was 600 miles in length and 300 miles in breadth.

boasts about this war, since you cannot gain much honour from it; and you do not make war within these kingdoms, which are so strong that war with them is no easy matter. I fully believe that if you could conquer them by means of threats and maledictions, you would readily do so.

“Now let us speak of the kingdom of France. It is very true that, not long before what I regard as the present time, there was great division within that kingdom between the lords of the royal blood of the same kingdom, from which has followed extraordinary and long continued war. The proverb says, ‘He who has a good neighbour has also a good morrow.’* When you knew of this war and division, you came forward with offers to the Duke of Orleans on the one hand, and to the Duke of Burgundy on the other, and you inflamed and exasperated the war by every means which you could conceive.† And when you saw that the war and division were at the height, you

* This appears to have been an English proverb, since Camden, in his *Remains*, has inserted amongst the *Proverbs of the English Nation*, *A good neighbour, a good morrow.*

† The responsibility of renewing the war with France rests with the French princes rather than with Henry V., since he only availed himself of their offers, and did not himself come forward in the first instance. Every contemporary historian admits this fact.

laboured incessantly with all your force to bring about the destruction of the kingdom, and you resolved to set up a claim to be king of France, and such you insisted upon being called. It is likewise true that by reason of this division, as well as because our king was of tender age and an infant,* King Henry of England made great conquests in this kingdom, and gained many towns and provinces, insomuch that during his life, and also after his death, there was a time when your conquests had reached as far as the river Loire, and even beyond ; yet all this did not happen without your having to fight great battles, and meeting with strong resistance.

“ Now let us see how Charles VII. of that name,† who is the present reigning king of France, has succeeded in resisting you ; for while he was in France,‡ and during his youth, you had the upper hand, and made fierce war against him. He has met with the greatest adversities and changes of fortune which could ever befall a king,

* Infant is here used in its legal sense, as meaning a person under age, and applies to Charles VII. In reality Henry V. made his conquests during the reign of Charles VI., who was not an infant.

† Charles VII. died A.D. 1461.

‡ The word *France* here seems to mean France proper, as distinguished from Guienne and Normandy, the ancient patrimony of the kings of England, which were fiefs not yet reduced into possession. The author soon afterwards marks very clearly the difference between France and Normandy.

and which it would detain me too long to relate. But after he had come to his full age, he found means by his great wisdom to reconcile the lords of his blood, and to restore amity between them, as well as to allay the war which had lasted so long. This being done, he soon afterwards found means to recover his city of Paris; then, by siege, his town and castle of Meux; and next, by siege and assault, Pontaise, where he himself was present; and, in fact, he expelled you from the whole of France, as far as the Duchy of Normandy. Soon afterwards he assumed the heart of a lion, and the courage of a prince, and with great force, at the head of his feudal vassals, he entered into his duchy of Normandy, and in a short space of time—what with sieges, battles, surprises, and other means—he drove and put you out of his duchy of Normandy, and did not leave you a single place in that country; and he conquered as much in one year as you and your King Henry had done in thirty-three years. Following up his good fortune, he advanced in the year 1450 with great power into the duchy of Guienne, and found many towns and castles which you occupied there—as Bourdeaux, Bayonne, Bourg, Blaye, Fronsac, Libourne, St. Emilion, St. Macaire, and several others, which, from the time of the conquest made by Philip, called the

Fortunate, king of France, had continued under your dominion, because in his lifetime he could not quite complete his conquest, but died in the interval.* Yet our King Charles, by means of assaults and sieges, has in a short time conquered that country, and brought it under his dominion. And although after his conquest the town of Bourdeaux rebelled against him, and submitted to the brother of Talbot the Englishman, the king gained a battle against this Talbot,† and soon afterwards resumed the siege of Bourdeaux by sea and land with such effect that the Bordelese were obliged to surrender at discretion. In fact, he has not left you a single place in Guienne, but has driven you back ignominiously into England. I think, Lady Prudence, that within the memory of man, such great and noble actions, and such great conquests, have never been achieved within so short a time as have been achieved by our King Charles, who now reigns.

“[You ought not],‡ Lady Prudence, to entrust honour to the guardianship of the English, who

* Philip I., or the Fortunate, died in 1351.

† This was the battle of Chatillon, which occurred in the year 1453, and in which the famous Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, was slain together with his son. The little army which he commanded had been the forlorn hope of England, and it fought resolutely to the last, but sustained a defeat that utterly extinguished the English power in France.

‡ These words appear to be wanting to complete the sense, in consequence of a typographical omission.

in so short a time have lost France, their duchy of Normandy, and the duchy of Guienne. And yet it is an easier thing to retain than to conquer. As I have said before, the English know how to begin wars, but they do not know how to finish them. They say that they are at war with four kings, and the reason is that they are not able to conquer them, for if they could bring them into subjection the war would cease. Thus their very boasts tell against them. It is not long ago that the King was at war with the Bordelese, as I have said before, but he soon conquered them; and now they are his subjects, and the war is finished.

“ Now let us speak on the subject of the sea. You say, Sir Herald, that the English are kings of the sea, and that they possess wonderful power and fine ships. To this I answer you; it is very true that he who is strongest on the sea may call himself king of the sea while his strength lasts. I also admit that you have a great number of fine ships; the reason of which is that your kingdom is an island, and therefore everything which is taken there or brought away must be conveyed in ships. You have many seaports all around your kingdom, and in each of these ports there is shipping: therefore, when the whole is assembled, there must of necessity be a great

number and force of ships. But I will show you that notwithstanding your great force of ships, you do not employ it in such a manner as to entitle you on that account to be advanced to honour. If your predecessors in times past, or in the middle times, or yourselves at the present time, possessing the ships in which you abound, had made, or did make, a great assemblage of them, well supplied with men and provisions, and set in order, and had gone against the infidels—as, for instance, against the King of Granada,*—or if, with your fine navy, you had made magnificent war against the infidels, you would have deserved great honour, and to be honourably mentioned in chronicles. But I find, Sir Herald, quite the contrary to what you say, and that neither your predecessors nor you have ever made magnificent war at sea. At all events there is no report of it anywhere. But it is very certain that your island is so situated that
• every merchant ship coming from the cold into the warm countries, or returning from the warm into
• the cold countries, must pass through your dangers of the sea, and sail along the coast of England, and especially through the straits of Calais and

* In point of fact, between thirty and forty years after this was written, a body of English volunteers did go against the King of Granada. See Additional Note 21, p. 105.

Dovor, where the opposite coasts are visible from each other. And this your shipping you employ to make war upon the poor merchants, and to plunder and rob them of their merchandise, and you make yourselves plunderers and pirates. The war which you carry on against the four kings is in reality against the said merchants of France, Spain, Denmark, and Scotland; and, in fact, you obstruct the utility of commerce everywhere. As I have said before, the great valour which your predecessors and you have exerted is to make war upon your neighbours. I say that you ought not to be advanced to honour upon that account, but you ought to be kept back from honour, and made ashamed, for you obstruct the utility of commerce throughout all Christendom; and you carry on no magnificent war against the infidels, but every kind of war and plunder against Christians.

“And because, Sir Herald of England, you speak so proudly of your shipping, by reason of which you call yourselves kings of the sea, I mean to show you that the King of France, when he pleases, will be king of the sea above you; and that he has many more resources, and is better suited to become so than you are. The case is this. I say that a prince who intends to become king of the sea must, of necessity, have

three things: first, deep and very strong harbours for the security of his ships; secondly, he must have abundance of great and swift ships; thirdly, he must have merchandise in his country with which he may employ his ships. These three things are so necessary, that one of them without the others is of no avail; for he who has harbours can do nothing if he have not ships, and without harbours the ships cannot be preserved; and if he have no merchandise to employ his ships with, they must rot in the harbours. Therefore I mean to show you that the King of France has these three things in a greater measure than you have them. For, in the first place, he has the harbour of Sluys,* which is one of the finest harbours in Christendom, and it is also strong for the protection of ships. In Normandy he has Dieppe and Harfleur,† which are enclosed harbours, and Gran-

* Sluys, though now fit for the reception of only small vessels, was formerly a deep and capacious harbour; the great fleet, consisting of 900 ships, for the invasion of England, having been assembled there in 1386.

† Harfleur, once the great port at the mouth of the Seine, is now little more than a harbour for fishing-boats, and the town has gradually fallen to decay, since Hâvre, or, as it was called in Queen Elizabeth's days, Newhaven, came into repute. The lofty and beautiful spire of the church at Harfleur, which is said to have been built by the English, and which somewhat resembles that at Salisbury, still remains, however, as a memorial of their former possession of the town. An English visitor at Hâvre, Honfleur, or Trouville, might find something more to interest him in Harfleur, since enough of the ancient fortification is left to give an idea of Henry V.'s siege of the place in 1415.

ville, where ships may anchor in safety. In Brittany he has St. Malo and Brest, where ships may lie in great safety. In Saintonge he has La Rochelle, which is the strongest harbour known. He has also Bourdeaux, where, by reason of the town, ships may be well secured; and he has Bayonne, and many other harbours. He has likewise many great rivers in his kingdom, where ships may be kept in safety. You, also, on your part, have fine roadsteads and harbours, but they are not enclosed; or, if some of them are, they are not so many, so strong, or so valuable as those of France. Thus, with respect to harbours, we have the advantage over you.

“With regard to ships, I will show that the King of France can have a great number of them when he pleases, and at less cost than you have them. Observe that, in the construction of ships, these three things are requisite: wood, iron, and artificers. As to wood, God knows what fine forests the King has in his kingdom, some of which are upon the banks of rivers, and conveniently situated for the building of ships. To say the truth, more hewn timber can be had in France for ten crowns than you can have in England for fifty. It is also the fact that, in consequence of the high price of wood, you are obliged to warm yourselves and cook

your food with coal,* which you would not do if wood were cheap. We will speak now of iron. You have iron in England, and we have abundance of it in France; but the best iron that there is for shipbuilding is the iron of Biscay or Spain, since it bends, and does not easily break. Now we dwell near Biscay, and are allies of the King of Spain, so we can procure it readily and cheaply. But, for your part, you cannot procure it except by means of safe-conducts,† and with great difficulty. With respect to artificers, there are as good artificers for shipbuilding in France as in any country in the world: namely, in Normandy, Brittany, and Guienne; and, if it be needful, in Spain. To say truth, a ship which may be built in France for a thousand or twelve hundred crowns, would cost more than two thousand nobles in England. Thus you may plainly see that the King of France can have great and swift ships in larger number, and at much less cost, than you can procure them. Let us now speak of the employment of ships. If I assume that the King should

* See Additional Note 22, p. 107.

† Safe-conducts were granted by a sovereign to subjects of a foreign power with which he was at war, protecting them, their ships, and merchandise against molestation during the period of hostilities. By this means, in the middle ages, the commerce between two kingdoms at war with each other was still carried on; the carrying trade by neutrals being then unknown.

have many great ships carrying a thousand or twelve hundred tons, then there is no prince who can fully employ them better than he. For he has two of the finest vine districts known, namely, Bourdeaux and La Rochelle, which are on the sea coast. In addition to this, he has salt, which is made in abundance by the action of the sun, as well at La Bassée * and in the neighbourhood, as at Brouage, in Saintonge. These two articles of merchandise alone are of no slight importance, since they require, and are sufficient for the employment of, a great number of ships. And if, upon good consideration of the matter, the King determined so to employ his ships, he would derive a great revenue from them; for his ships would gain, by freight or otherwise, what foreigners now gain in his kingdom, which would be a great profit to his people, and the money would remain in his country; since it is reasonable that his ships should be first served. You also have good merchandise in England, but it is not merchandise of such heavy weight for loading great ships as wine and salt; and you must, of necessity, have such wine and salt from

* *La Bassée* (in the original, *la Bace*). We have been unable to identify this place, unless it be the village of La Bassée, formerly in the province of Poitou, and at present in the department of the Deux Sèvres. The salt-works at Brouage, at no great distance from La Bassée, still maintain their celebrity.

the kingdom of France, either by safe-conduct or by smuggling, otherwise your ships would have no employment, and would perish in the mire. Besides, you would have nothing wherewith to salt your fish, which is the chief source of wealth and employment for ships that you possess.* By these two articles of merchandise your great shipping is supported, and that solely by means of the kingdom of France, for otherwise you would not have a sufficiency of them. Therefore, Sir Herald, you see that the King of France has all the three things which are needful for him who would become king of the sea, and he has much more of them than you have; and these circumstances are greatly to his ad-

* This is contrary to the fact, for though fish formed an important article of commerce, it was secondary to wool, both in regard to value and weight. Edmund Dudley, the able but extortionate minister of Henry VII., says, in his *Tree of the Commonwealth*, with respect to England: "The commodities of this noble realm be so noble, and with that so plenteous, that they cannot be spende or all employed within the same, but necessarily there must be intercourse between this realm and outward parts, for the utterance thereof, and specially for the wool and cloth, tin and lead, felt and hide, besides divers other commodities, that doth great ease to the subjects." In this passage, written in the year 1509, it will be observed that fish is not even mentioned. An early instance of mercantile ingenuity, in connection with wool, the chief article of English commerce in those days, may here be mentioned. In order to evade the high export duties to which wool was liable, it became a practice to carry over sheep to Flanders and shear them there. This evasion was checked by a statute passed in 1424 (3 Hen. VI. c. 2), which rendered illegal the transportation of sheep beyond sea, without the King's licence.

vantage whenever it shall please him to undertake the design of making himself king of the sea. And observe the power which he has to destroy your great shipping, when he chooses to give orders to that effect. Sir Herald, I will show you that when it shall please the King of France, he is able, without quitting his palace, to ruin all the great shipping of England; and this is how he may do so. It is the well-established, notorious, and regular practice for this shipping to come to Brittany, or Guienne, for the purpose of procuring salt, and conveying it into the cold countries; and also to come to Guienne, at the season of the vintage, and likewise in the month of March, for the purpose of conveying wines into England and divers other countries, otherwise such shipping would lie idle. The King shall give commandment that no safe-conducts be granted to any English ship above the burden of a hundred tons, but shall order them to be granted to smaller vessels upon easy terms; and he shall prohibit the sale of wine or salt to any English ship exceeding the burden of a hundred tons. By this means the common shipping of England and Brittany, as well as of other countries, will have reputation and employment. Thus your great shipping must necessarily rot in the mire

for want of employment and wages to the seamen; and the great shipping of the cold countries will have the profits which your great shipping was accustomed to have. I will show you that, by the maritime law of war,* the French have great advantages over you at sea, and this is the reason. If a ship sailing from England is overtaken by a storm at sea, and is not able to return to a harbour of that country, or of the kingdom of Portugal, your ally,† it must run out to sea to the Great Swin, ‡ and struggle with the waves. For since you are hated by all your neighbours, it would not dare to take refuge in the harbours of France, Spain, Scotland, or Denmark, and thus it happens that many ships are lost at sea. This is not likely to be the case with the shipping of France; for, as the French are beloved by all their neighbours, they can take refuge in all the harbours between Sluys and Bayonne, and

* See Additional Note 23, p. 108.

† See Additional Note 24, p. 108.

‡ The original passage thus translated is *au Soyne dicte maiour*. The only Swin at present known about the coasts of England is a shoal of that name at the mouth of the Thames. This, however, could hardly be the Great Swin alluded to, if we have rightly understood the text. In an English poem inserted in *Hakluyt* (i. 188), and which was written between the years 1411 and 1437, there occur the following two lines, which may possibly throw some light upon the point, and seem to point out the Great Swin as being near Sluys:—

“The hauen of Scluse hir hauen for her repayre
Wich is cleped *Swyn* the ships giding.”

they are well received everywhere in Germany, and meet with good cheer. Thus they have a great advantage over you by maritime law, since it is safer to be in a harbour than to beat about upon the sea. They have also a great advantage over you in fighting, for you have solely archers on board, and an archer can only kill at sea when he is on the upper deck of the ship, and in great danger himself, and so he cannot take good aim in consequence both of his fear and the motion of the vessel. This is different with the French, for they make use of the cross-bow,* and a cross-bowman can shoot under cover from the forecastle or stern-castle, without danger or peril; and even in his doublet, and through a small hole, he can kill or wound his enemy, since, however great may be his fear, or the motion of the vessel, the cross-bow will give force to its arrow. Hence it is seen that a French ship at sea always defeats an English ship of the same size.† The French

* See Additional Note 25, p. 111.

† The English during the latter years of the disastrous reign of Henry VI. had lost their supremacy on the sea. In the *Chronicle of London*, written by a contemporary, and edited by Sir H. Nicolas, it is stated, under the year 1442 or 1443, "Also in this yere was gret losse of shippes in the narroe see on our party, be enemyes of Depe, Boloigne, and Bretayne" (p. 132). Abundance of similar evidence might be adduced to prove that, during the career of victory which the French enjoyed upon land, they were correspondingly successful at sea. Hence, with

have another advantage over the English in the means by which war can be carried on, for you can make war in France only upon one of its sides, namely, between Sluys and Bayonne. But because you are in an island, and surrounded by the sea, the French can make war all around you, and on every coast of your kingdom, whether east, west, north, or south; and thus it is plain they can do you much more harm than you can do them. If you ask me why they do not make the attempt, I answer that some things are done willingly and for pleasure, and others from necessity and strong compulsion. There is no need for the King of France to have a great number of ships, since his country is almost everywhere adapted for the conveyance of goods by means of horses. On the other hand, there is a powerful nobility in France, who, for several reasons, much prefer war on land to war at sea. For there is danger and loss of life, and God knows what distress, when a storm arises; seasickness, also, is, by many people, hard to be borne; and the rough life which it is necessary to lead does not well suit noblemen.* If, there-

reference to the period of about twenty years before the text was written, there was some basis of truth for the fact which the French herald has here asserted. See also *infra*, p. 200.

* See Additional Note 26, p. 111.

fore, the King would make himself king of the sea, he must do so for mere pleasure, and in order to chastise you, and show his power. But, Sir Herald, it is a different matter in your kingdom, for whether churchmen, noblemen, or others, you must, of necessity, encounter the dangers and accidents of the sea, both the rough life and the storm, since you cannot go in or out or carry on commerce otherwise than by sea, and unless you have shipping. But, understand, that when the King of France chooses to take upon himself to do so, he is able, for the reasons before mentioned, to make himself king of the sea above you. Also, if the King be desirous of reinforcing his navy, he can apply to the King of Spain, who is his brother and ally, who is well provided with great and sumptuous ships and galleys, and who has mariners much renowned in naval war, to be pleased to send him some of them, which he will willingly do, and that without their costing the King of France anything. The King is also lord of Genoa,* where there are great carracks and galleys, which will always come at the command of the King, whenever it shall please him to send for them. And, further, I tell you that, by the maritime law of war, the French have great advantages over

* See Additional Note 27, p. 112.

the English, which I do not now think proper to acquaint you with, since there is no need to give too much information to an enemy. So this must suffice you for the present. And, therefore, I pray to God that He will give the King of France spirit and courage to make war against you upon the sea, for this is the rod with which he may punish you, and cool your lofty courage. And all your neighbours, when it shall please him to make the attempt . . . *

“Therefore, most high and most excellent princess, Lady Prudence, the Cardinal Virtue, I, the herald of France, say that the herald of England has spoken nothing with respect to valour in times past, in the middle times, or at the present time, by reason of which you ought to advance the kingdom of England to honour; and that the English have no reason for calling themselves kings of the sea. But I have answered him on the two subjects of pleasure and valour in such a manner as to make it clear to you that the kingdom of France ought to be preferred and highly advanced to honour. And as to what remains, let him speak, and I will answer him.”

* In the original, the paragraph breaks off here abruptly.

THE HERALD OF ENGLAND SPEAKS
OF RICHES.

“I say, Lady Prudence, that riches are a fine thing for a great lord to possess. And because the kingdom of England is full of great nobleness and riches, I say and maintain that it ought to be advanced to honour; and in order to support my opinion, I mean to show you some of the riches of England. I say, then, that there are riches of three kinds: riches upon the land, riches under the land, and riches around the land. And of these three kinds of riches I will speak.

“In the first place, with respect to riches upon the land, I say that there are riches of three kinds: riches of people, riches of fruits, and riches of cattle.

Of Riches of People.

“I say, Lady Prudence, that it is wonderful what a fine and abundant population there is in England, consisting of churchmen, nobles, and craftsmen, as well as common people. To say the truth, you will see such great and populous villages there, that if they were only enclosed within walls, they might be called great towns;*

* See Additional Note 28, p. 112.

and this is the case not with one village only, but with many, and, in my opinion, England may be said to be a little world of people.

Of Riches of Fruits.

“It is a fine thing to see the abundance of fruits which grow in England, for the country is level and all of it cultivated, and there are no waste lands there. Also, by reason of the great extent of cultivation, there are hardly any woods, but the people warm themselves with coal, which they dig out of the ground, as I shall afterwards mention ; and there are great quantities of wheat, rye, and oats, as well as all kinds of vegetables more plentifully than in any other country known.

Of Riches of Cattle.

“England is abundantly supplied with cattle, namely, oxen, cows, swine, and horses, and especially with sheep, which produce the finest and choicest wool that can be found anywhere, from which the fine cloths and scarlet stuffs are made ; and the merchants of the kingdom carry them for sale into divers kingdoms and countries. And such great quantities of them are produced, that the common tables at

Calais* have them for all who choose to purchase; and a wonderful amount of wealth is gained by them. Therefore I say, Lady Prudence, that for the three causes which I have mentioned, there is not in the world so rich a country as England.

Of Riches under the Land.

“The riches under the land are the fine and valuable mines which it contains. In Cornwall there are very rich tin mines; and there are lead mines, in which ore is found yielding silver, and mines of metal,† alabaster, black and white marble, whetstones, and iron. There are likewise mines of coal, with which fire is made, and the people warm themselves throughout the country, and large quantities of which are carried into divers countries for sale. In fact, Lady Prudence, the merchants of England maintain and say that the kingdom is of greater value under the land than it is above.

* These common tables were probably in the open streets or market-place, it being still the practice to expose for sale articles of dress and stuffs for making clothing, in the provincial towns of France on market-days. Scarlet stuffs, or scarlets, as they were called, formed an important article of commerce, and are mentioned in the great charter granted by Edward I. to foreign merchants in 1303, when a duty of two shillings was imposed upon each. (*Hakluyt*, i. 137.) Calais, it will be remembered, was an English town during the whole of the fifteenth century.

† See Additional Note 29, p. 112.

Of Riches around the Land.

“England being an island almost entirely surrounded by the sea,* fish is produced in great abundance along all the coasts; and the people catch it in such plenty, that, after the country is well provided, they salt and prepare it in large quantities. This fish, salted and prepared, the merchants of England carry for sale into divers kingdoms and countries, and thereby gain great sums of money. Thus, Lady Prudence, you have the secret of the three kinds of riches in England—namely, riches upon the land, under the land, and around the land. And hence it appears that there are riches on all sides.

“Moreover, there is an ancient law in England, that the merchants shall never carry out of the kingdom into foreign countries either gold or silver, except it be a very small sum; but they can export in abundance the before-mentioned merchandise, and sell it for gold and silver, which they bring home into their own kingdom; and thus they cunningly withdraw and bring to their own home and kingdom the money of the neighbouring countries. Also when foreign merchants

* This solecism occurs in the original, though possibly it may arise from some typographical error.

bring wines or other commodities into England, the English let them sell their merchandise, but never suffer them to carry away much gold or silver;* and hence such merchants must of necessity buy merchandise, or barter their own for that of England. Thus it is no wonder that there should be great riches of gold and silver in England, since they are constantly imported, and it is not permitted to carry them away. In truth, Lady Prudence, I think it certain that, considering the size of England, there is not so rich a country in Christendom.

“Hence, Lady Prudence, as I have plainly shown to you what I promised with respect to pleasure, valour, and riches, I now come to the conclusion, that, in spite of what the herald of

* There are several enactments in our Statute-book against carrying the precious metals out of the realm; the earliest which we have found being that of 9 Edward III. (A.D. 1335). The particular statute referred to in the text is the 2 Henry VI., c. 6. (A.D. 1423), which prohibits, under the penalty of forfeiture, the exportation of gold or silver without the King's licence. This prohibition was enforced against Erasmus, upon his quitting England in 1499; and he bitterly complains in his Epistles that the searchers at Dover had robbed him of nearly 20%, which was almost all the money that he possessed, and which he had acquired by means of his diligent labours in this country. It would seem that the revival of this obsolete statute, in the case of Erasmus, was one of the extortions practised by Empson and Dudley; and when the day of reckoning came for those Ministers, it is likely that the treatment of the illustrious scholar was not forgotten.

66 *England and France in the 15th Century.*

France has said, you ought to advance the kingdom of England to honour before all other kingdoms."

And hereupon the herald of England ceased speaking.

THE HERALD OF FRANCE ANSWERS
WITH RESPECT TO RICHES.

“Most high and most excellent princess, Lady Prudence, the herald of England endeavours to show you that, in consequence of the great riches which are in England, you ought to advance that kingdom to honour before all others; and he says that in the same kingdom there are riches upon the land, under the land, and around the land. I shall now answer to each article.

“In the first place, he says that there are upon the land riches of three kinds: riches of people, of fruits, and of cattle.

•

The Herald of France speaks of the People.

“Let us now, Sir Herald, speak in the first place of the riches of the people of the clergy. I say that in France there are three estates: the people of the clergy, the people of the nobility, and the common people. Concerning the people of the clergy, I say, and will plainly show, that there is a much greater number of clergy in France than in England, in consequence of which ninety-five bishops are required in France, while in England there are only

fourteen bishops and two archbishops.* Thus, if only the cathedral churches of France were in question, it must be said that the clergy are more numerous than in England; but God knows whether there are not also fine collegiate churches, and many of them. With respect to the religious orders, we have the mother-abbeyes on this side, as Cîteaux, Cluny, and Clairvaux; and we have also Fontevrault, the mother-abbey of ladies.† Indeed, I think there is no religious order which is not largely endowed in France; and many benefices which you have on the other side are in the patronage, collation, and gift of the abbeyes on this side. Also we have seven universities in France:‡ Paris, which excels all the others, Orleans, Angers, Poitiers, Montpellier, Toulouse, and Cahors; and you have only two—Oxford and Cambridge. Thus it is very evident that we have a much more dignified clergy than you have; and I wonder that you are so presumptuous as to think the clergy of England equal to that of France.

* See Additional Note 30, p. 113.

† Full information respecting these abbeyes, and the subordinate foundations dependent upon them, will be found in Gough's *Account of the Alien Priories*, 2 vols. 12mo. 1779. The statute, 35 Edward I., passed in 1307, also throws light on the subject.

‡ See Additional Note 31, p. 113.

*The Names of all the Churches of great magnificence
in the Kingdom of France.*

“ Since, Sir Herald, we have to speak on the subject of holy Church and the clergy, believe me; we have such churches that, in point of decoration and magnificence; you do not even come near them. Such are those of Our Lady, at Paris, Chartres, Rouen, Amiens, and Rheims; of St. Stephen at Bourges and of St. Gatien at Tours-Marmoutier. The matter indeed will bear no argument, for it is manifest; and they who have been in both kingdoms can well declare the truth, and give information of it to Lady Prudence.

“ Also, Sir Herald, you have no such relics in England as there are in France: namely, the crown with which our Lord was crowned on the day of his crucifixion, the nails by which he was suspended to the tree of the cross, and also a fragment of that cross; the iron head of the spear with which he was pierced, and the foreskin of our Lord Jesus Christ, which Charlemagne left at Charroux; also the holy winding-sheet wherein our Lord was wrapped, which is at Toulouse; and the bodics of six of the Apostles of Jesus Christ, which are in the church in the

same town.* Sir Herald, in consequence of the singular devotion to our Lord which the kings of France have shown in the extension of our faith, they have diligently collected these relics and put them out of the power of the infidels. I refer to the Chronicles for the means which they employed in recovering them, since, if you have been in France,† you have paid but little attention to the subject of the Church and all the matters before mentioned.

“When the clergy of Christendom are assembled there are four nations: France, Spain, Lombardy, and Germany. You are no nation, but are under the German nation. Thus it clearly appears that the clergy of France is ten times greater than that of England, for it is a nation of itself, while you are only a member of the German nation.‡

* In 1561 was printed “A very profitable Treatise, made by M. John Calvin, declaring what great profit might come to all Christendom, if there were a register made of all Saints’ bodies, and other reliques, which are as well in Italy, as in France, Duchland, Spain,” &c. In this little treatise the several reliques mentioned in the text are noticed. The six bodies of the Apostles at Toulouse are stated to be those of St. James the Greater, St. Andrew, St. James the Less, St. Philip, St. Simon, and St. Jude.

† See Additional Note 32, p. 114.

‡ At the meeting of the Council of Constance, the question arose how the votes of the members constituting that assembly should be reckoned; and in order that the ecclesiastics belonging to the States on this side the Alps might not be outvoted by the preponderance of Italian prelates, it was settled that the votes should be counted, not by

“Take notice, that all Christendom does honour to France, and regards France as the first of nations; and the German nation, under which you are, as is before mentioned, especially does so. You ought, therefore, to do as your said nation does, and give honour to France, and not to put yourself upon an equality with her; and you ought to retract what you have said, and acknowledge your error.

individual members, but by nations. The further question, which is adverted to in the text, of how many nations Christendom was divided into, does not appear to have been then discussed; but Italy, Germany, England, and France were acknowledged to be the four nations representing Christianity; since Spain, which had not yet joined the Council, was left out of consideration. This arrangement continued undisturbed during nearly two years, until, in 1416, Spain was admitted into the Council as a fifth nation. Shortly afterwards the French raised the question as to the right of England to form a separate nation, and maintained that the enemy who had recently fought against them at Agincourt was only a member of the German nation. The dispute thus originated led to an acrimonious controversy between the representatives of the two kingdoms, and the speeches on each side, which have been preserved and frequently printed, are amongst the curiosities of history; particularly that of the English orator, if read by the light of the Jesuit Labbé's derisive comments upon it. The Council, however, promptly decided the question in favour of England.

The assertion in the text denying the right of the English to form a distinct nation, which they were excessively proud of, would probably have been resented by an Englishman of that day more than any other of the charges which the author has brought forward to their disparagement. See also the Note p. 42; the Introduction, *supra*, and the Additional Note, No. 5, p. 94.

Of the People of the Nobility of France.

“ Sir Herald, if you would match the nobility of England with that of France, you plunge into a sea of difficulties, for I will show you that before England ever was England, aye, and before Albion ever was Britain, there was a great nobility in France, as will appear from what follows. When Brutus proceeded by sea to people the island of Albion, he first came into the river Loire. And because his followers ravaged the country, it so fell out that Geoffrey the Pict, King of Aquitania, fought with him and lost the battle. The latter then went away to rally the French; and in the meantime Brutus and his people ascended the river Loire, as far as the city of Tours, where he found the French ready to fight with him. There Turonus, a nephew of Brutus, was killed, and being buried at Tours, that city derived its name from him. Then Brutus, seeing the great resistance offered by the French, withdrew, and went away into the island of Albion, which is at present called England. Thus, since it appears that Geoffery the Pict fought against Brutus, and that the kings of France also fought against him at Tours, it must be admitted that thenceforward

there was a great nobility in France.* At that time England was still inhabited only by the giants; and it was afterwards called Britain, and is at present called England, as is before mentioned.

“Sir Herald, if you would speak of the nobility of the present day, I say that the crown of France is marvellously well founded upon and supported by the twelve noble pillars whom we call the Peers of France:† namely, three dukes and three counts of the Church, and three dukes and three counts of the temporal nobility. The pillars of the Church, being dukes, are the archbishop of Rheims, the bishop of Laon, and the bishop of Langres; and the counts are the bishops of Noyon, Châlons,* and Beauvais. The temporal lords are the Duke of Burgundy, the Duke of Guienne, and the Duke of Normandy, together with the Counts of Champagne, Flanders, and Toulouse, which latter county com-

* See Additional Note 33, p. 114.

† The origin of the Peers of France is involved in obscurity, and has been supposed to be almost as ancient as the monarchy. Philip Augustus fixed the number of them at twelve, and availed himself of their authority to try King John of England for the murder of his nephew Arthur, and upon his being found guilty, to condemn him to the forfeiture of all his dominions in France. This is said to have been the first judgment ever delivered by the Twelve Peers sitting as a Court. The number of Peers subsequently became unlimited, until the institution was abolished at the revolution in 1789.

prises the whole province of Languedoc. Think within yourself what these lords are whom I have named to you ; for they have many counts, viscounts, barons, knights, and gentlemen, who are their liege men and subjects ; and they have also many great walled towns ; and, in fact, saving the sovereignty of the King, they are the true lords of the provinces whose name they bear. Thus you may see, Sir Herald, what the nobility of France are, and whether you ought to be compared with them. If I were to mention the ancient counties and great feudal lordships of this kingdom, it would tend much to the honour of the nobility ; and if, Sir Herald, you would say that some of these provinces are at present annexed to the crown of France, I answer you that the crown is so much the stronger. We have also other dukes, as the Dukes of Orleans, Anjou, Brittany, Bourbon, and Alençon, who are actual lords of the dominions, towns, and countries whose names they bear.

“ You know well, Sir Herald, that this is not the case in England, for it was not long ago that you had no dukes ; the first duke made being the Duke of Lancaster,* and even he was made a

* This is not exactly correct, as the Black Prince was created Duke of Cornwall several years before the dignity of duke was conferred

duke within the memory of man. The dukes whom you have made since, and whom you are making every day, although you give them the title, yet they are not the lords of the town or country whose title they bear, which is a great slur upon nobility. For a duke is in title next to a king, and ought to have great lords and lordships subject to him, as is before mentioned; and if he have no nobles or people under him, but only an honorary title, it is but a slender duchy. In fact, it is as though the Pope made bishops for heathen countries, or as heralds are made.

“ Since we are on the subject of nobility, consider what dwellings the nobles of France have; for they commonly possess fine castles and fortresses, where they can live securely, and shelter their men and subjects, if necessary; or when there is war, can maintain their loyalty to their prince until they have succour. But in England you have only simple manor-houses; or, if you have any castles, for every one that you have we have fifty.* For these reasons which I have mentioned, you may see that you cannot and ought not to compare the nobility of England with that of France.

upon Henry Earl of Lancaster in 1351. Richard II. at one time, in the year 1397, created as many as five dukes.

* See Additional Note 34, p. 115.

Of the Mechanics, or Common People.

“As you boast, Sir Herald, that you have a greater number of mechanics and common people than there are in France, I shall show you the contrary; since for one walled town that you have, we have more than a dozen well peopled with mechanics and other inhabitants. Also we have all the mechanical crafts which you have, and we have others besides; for we have people employed in the superior kinds of textures, such as Arras tapestry, which is much esteemed, and highly ornamental in the courts of kings and princes.* We have also linen of the most excellent quality which a kingdom can possess, at Troyes in Champagne, in the city of Creton, and generally throughout France. We have likewise the best jewellers, who produce the most beautiful specimens of workmanship which can be imagined. Also we make paper and verdegris in France, and you make none in England.† You

* In a note to Dallaway's *Discourses upon Architecture in England* (p. 386) will be found some information respecting the ancient manufacture of tapestry in our own country.

† Paper is generally supposed to have been first made in England in the year 1590, at Dartford, in Kent, by a German who established a paper-mill there. It would appear, however, that this is a mistake, since in Trevisa's translation of Bartholomeus, *De proprietatibus rerum*,

have no workmen to make the things before mentioned, and if you have any of the things themselves, they are counterfeit, and of little value. Therefore I tell you we have more of all things than you have; and whenever you can procure any articles of elegant workmanship, they are made in France. You say that the common people in England are a little world; but I believe that there are more labourers employed upon the vines of France than there are men of all conditions whatever in England.

*The Herald of France answers with respect to the
Fruits upon the Land.*

“ Sir Herald, you say that you have great abundance of corn and grain. I answer you that it is very necessary you should have large quantities of them; for you waste more corn in making your drink—that is to say, your beer and good ale—than you eat;* and yet you have not so much but that, when you are able to procure it from France, you eagerly come to fetch it, either by

printed by Winkin de Worde, nearly a century earlier, it is stated that John Tate the Younger lately made in England the paper,

“ That now in our Englyfsh this boke is prynted innce.”

Beckman, in his *History of Inventions* (Bohn's ed. p. 173), says, “ It is certain that even in the fifteenth century the making of verdegris was an old and profitable branch of commerce in France.”

* See Additional Note 35, p. 116.

means of safe-conduct or otherwise. I answer you in another manner, that we possess so plentifully the corn you have mentioned, that all our neighbours come to fetch it; since, thank God, the soil of France is most fertile. Also we have many things which you have not. In the first place, we have wine, which is the most delicious of liquids, and which is grown in abundance throughout the kingdom of France; and this wine is of various sorts and degrees of strength, white and red, and of all kinds; and there is such plenty of it, that our labourers drink no beer, but they drink only wine. The merchants of the cold countries come to fetch it, as you yourselves do when you can obtain it. We have also salt made by force of the sun; and you have none, except what you come to fetch, and we are so kind as to allow you to carry away. You make salt from sea-water by force of artificial heat, which is a work of difficulty, and the salt is of little value. We have walnuts, olives, from which oil is made, also almonds, figs, raisins, kermes, woad, and many other things of which you have none.* These things you can only

* Kermes, as a dye, has been superseded in modern times by cochineal and lac; the red coats of the officers in our army being dyed with the former, and of the common soldiers with the latter

Woad was imported from Toulouse (see Stat. 4, Henry VII., c. 10, A.D. 1487).

obtain by the favour of France, and they are great and valuable articles of commerce. We have also all kinds of delicious fruit, as well summer as winter fruits, so that we are supplied with them throughout the year, the old fruit lasting until the new comes in ; which is not the case in England, for you have very little fruit. You have a small quantity in the county of Kent, but it is ill-flavoured, and would not suffice for the little children of London. And if you allege the Cross at Cheap,* where there is a fine garden, I answer you that the merchants bring the fruit from Flanders, or Normandy, or from some other kingdom than your own.

Of Riches of Cattle.

“ Sir Herald, you say that you have riches of cattle. I answer you that we have them also, and in abundance. As to what you say of the fine wool of your sheep, I tell you that in some districts of France the sheep are as good as yours;

* This is an ironical allusion to the fruit market held near the ancient Cross in Cheap, or Cheapside, in the city of London. In the *Liber Albus*, compiled in the year 1419, and in Maddox's *History of the Exchequer*, this market is several times mentioned. Arnold's *Chronicle* (ed. 1811, p. 164) contains an article on “The craft of graffing and plantinge of trees, and altering of Frutis,” &c., which gives information on the subject of the fruits cultivated in England in the fifteenth century. See also the Additional Note 16, p. 100.

for we have better woollen cloths, both finer and better dyed, at Rouen, Montivilliers, Paris, Bourges, Creton, and other places, where drapery is made. These fine cloths are commonly sold at the rate of a crown or two more an ell than yours are. It must, therefore, be admitted either that we have better wool than you have, or that you are so unskilful that you cannot make up your cloths. And, also, I tell you more, that we have cattle which you have not, namely, male and female mules, and he-asses and she-asses, and we have likewise much more cattle than you. Therefore, Sir Herald, do not boast of your wealth upon the land, for you lose your cause at once, and I refer it confidently to Lady Prudence.

*The Herald of France answers with respect to
Riches under the Land.*

“Sir Herald, you say that the kingdom of England is worth as much or more under the land than above, and you mention several mines which you say are very valuable. To this I answer you, that if you have mines in England, so we have also in France. We have gold—the most precious metal that there is—which the refiners find in the rivers Rhone and Vienne, and in other rivers of France. It is known

to the merchants of the kingdom of France that here there are mines also. On the Rhone, in the neighbourhood of Lyons, there are silver mines, where workmen are constantly employed. We have also in many districts limestone quarries,* yielding a great quantity of saltpetre, which is very necessary in war.

“To what you allege so strongly in favour of your coal, I answer you that we also have coal in many parts of France, and they who choose to take the trouble may find abundance of it, but with us it is used only in forges, and by farriers; for, thank God, the kingdom of France is so well endowed, that corn, wine, and wood are to be found in every district; and the wood is used for warmth and for the preparation of food, and is a thing much more agreeable than your coal.

•

*The Herald of France answers with respect to
Riches around the Land.*

“Sir Herald, you say that the kingdom of England is quite surrounded by the sea, and that you catch fish in such abundance along all your coasts that, from this fish prepared and salted, you gain a wonderful amount of wealth. To

* See Additional Note 36, p. 117.

this I answer you, that the word ‘surrounded’* by the sea is very disadvantageous to you, and that it would be much better for you if you were like the kingdom of France. For one side of that kingdom is on the sea, like you are, namely, from Flanders to Bayonne, which is a great length of seaboard, and the people of France catch all sorts of fish in the same manner that you do. Also at one extremity, towards Languedoc, they have the Dead Sea.† They have likewise more ; for they have four rivers, which lie so conveniently, that all the produce which grows in the kingdom of France can, at the pleasure of the inhabitants, be readily conveyed to the sea—first, the river Rhone, which, being joined by the Saone, separates the kingdom of France from the Empire, and, flowing on to Beaucaire,‡ falls into the sea ; the river Loire, which runs from Roanne as far as Brittany, through a country abounding in all kinds of produce ; the river Seine, running into Normandy, where it is joined

* The reason why the word *surrounded* is disadvantageous is explained a little further on in the text.

† In the original, *Mer morte*. If this be not a typographical error, the Mediterranean Sea may have been so called in consequence of its tides being scarcely perceptible. No other sea has been known by so many different names, but we have been unable to find an authority for its being designated the *Dead Sea*.

‡ Beaucaire is opposite Tarrascon, to which it is joined by a handsome stone bridge, and is now seven leagues distant from the sea.

by several good rivers ; the river Somme, which flows through Picardy, and runs into the sea ; and the very beautiful and famous river Gironde, in Guienne, which is joined by the rivers Garonne, Dordogne, and many others, conveying an immense quantity of produce from the upper country. And you must know that the Gironde is one of the finest rivers in the world, being navigable for large sea-going ships twenty-six leagues or more. We have also the river which runs to Bayonne ;* in Saintonge we have the river Charente, which bears sea-going ships very far inland, as well as the river Brouage ; and in Poitou we have the rivers Sèvre, Lay, and Vie, which are navigable. Indeed, there is not a kingdom in the world better supplied or accommodated with rivers and streams than the kingdom of France. Thus the kingdom of France has this advantage over you, that it avails itself of the sea and of these rivers when it pleases ; and people may travel by land without passing the sea into Spain, Lombardy, and Germany, or wherever they choose ; but you cannot do so, for you are surrounded by the sea, and unable to leave your kingdom except by sea. If a powerful prince were king of the sea, and stronger than you, you would be besieged, and could not

* That is, the Adour.

obtain succour, and your riches around the land would be lost. Hence this word 'surrounded' is very disadvantageous to you.

"The kingdom of France is much more favourably situated than you are, for it lies between the cold and the hot countries. The hot countries beyond the mountains* are hard to be endured, in consequence of the great and excessive heat; and the cold countries in which you dwell are very prejudicial to the human frame, for the winter in them begins so early, and lasts so long, that the people live in pain and cold, and hardly any fruit grows there; and that which does grow is ill-flavoured. But France, which lies between, and in the midst of both, enjoys a peculiar excellence,† for there the air is most mild and agreeable, every fruit grows to maturity, and is plentiful and delicious, and the people live pleasantly in a temperate climate, without too much heat or too much cold.

"Therefore, Sir Herald, abandon all hope in thinking to compare the island of England with the kingdom of France, whether in situation, in fruits, in nobility, or in any other thing, for we have all that you have, and we have also more of all things than you have. And the more you

* That is, beyond the Alps and the Pyreneces.

† See Additional Note 37, p. 118.

discuss this matter the more ridiculous and shameful will be your failure ; but you are so pertinacious that you think to prevail by force of obstinacy.

The Herald of France answers with respect to the great Riches boasted of by the Herald of England.

“ Sir Herald, you have boasted of great riches, and you say that, for the reasons before declared, England is, in proportion to its size, the richest country in Christendom. To this I answer you, that no wise man ever boasts of great riches ; for a rich man never lives in security, since everyone envies him.* It is the same with a kingdom. Have we not the history of Darius, who called himself the rich King of Persia ? Alexander, his adversary, called himself the least of the Greeks. Then the latter said to his companions, ‘ If we fight with Darius, you will all become very rich ;’ and Alexander so conducted affairs, that he gained four battles over Darius, and made himself King of Persia. And I say, Sir Herald, that even if you had reason for boasting so much of riches, you would then be like Darius, and the

* This remark suggests a sad picture of the general insecurity of the times.

King of France might undertake to conquer you, and bring you into subjection. For it is a well-known fact that he has a just quarrel against you ; in the first place, because you killed and murdered King Richard, who was married to the daughter of France, and that bad business has never yet been avenged.* And all kings and princes ought to aid him in this design, since he may lawfully undertake it whenever it shall be his pleasure. Also, under cover of the divisions in France, you have pillaged and robbed this kingdom, and committed innumerable evils. You have also carried away great numbers of the sons and daughters, the children of this kingdom, and detain them in strict custody.† Therefore he has a just right to go and fetch his subjects,‡ whom you have carried away, to recover the property which you have taken off, and to make you pay the penalty of the outrages which you have committed in his kingdom. And this point is conclusively determined in the ‘Tree of Battle,’§

* Richard II. of England was married to Isabella, a daughter of Charles VI. of France. This princess was the King's second wife, and was left his widow at a very early age. See Additional Note 38, p. 118.

† It is rather tantalising that these words should be merely a conjectural translation ; but the original passage is *en chait maison*, which we can only imagine may be a typographical error for *en étroite prison*.

‡ See Additional Note 39, p. 120.

§ Two editions of the *Book of Battle* (*Arbre de Bataille*) are noticed

chaps. 24 and 25, *cum ibi notatis*. For a prince may lawfully make war to recover his property, or the property of his subjects.

The King of France ought to desire this conquest for four reasons. *First*, for the just quarrel before mentioned. *Secondly*, for the great riches which you boast of, since it is no conquest for a king to conquer a poor country, and he ought not to risk his nobility or gentry in such an enterprise ; but to conquer so rich a country as you speak of, he ought to risk everything. *Thirdly*, because a conqueror ought to wish for battle, in order to make an end of his conquest ; and if he would invade England, you must, of necessity, either give him battle, or yield up the country, since you have but few walled towns, and hardly any castles. Your country is level, and there are no mountains or great rivers to impede anywhere the progress of an enemy, nor are you able to support a burdensome war. And if the conqueror gain the battle, he may call himself king of England, for he who is the strongest on the land may call himself king of the sea. It plainly appeared in the time of King Richard, who was the true king and possessor of England, that when the

by Brunet, both of them printed in the fifteenth century. * This work was an authority on international law towards the close of the middle ages. See Additional Note 40, p. 120.

Earl of Derby* proved to be the strongest on the land, that king was obliged to resign his kingdom, and afterwards he was wickedly murdered. *Fourthly*, because the attempt to conquer England has frequently redounded to the advantage and honour of those who have engaged in it, as King Charlemagne, William the Conqueror, Duke of Normandy, the King of Denmark,† and several others, as is shown in the book of the ‘Brut.’‡ Hence the King at present reigning, seeing the grace which God has given him, ought not to be in a worse plight than the others. Therefore, Sir Herald, cease to boast of such great riches, for the dangers which I have just described are not all over, and be assured that there is a certain nobleman in France,§ who, with the King’s good aid, has a strong inclination to go and visit you. And as to the riches of France, God be thanked, they are very abundantly sufficient.

“Most high and most excellent Princess, Lady Prudence, may it please you to remember that I have already said that the Saxons, otherwise

* This was Henry of Bolingbroke, better known as Duke of Lancaster, and afterwards Henry IV. of England.

† The king of Denmark here referred to was Canute the Great, who became king of England before the Norman Conquest.

‡ See the Note p. 20 *supra*.

§ See Additional Note 41, p. 121.

called the English, are great boasters, that they despise every other people except their own, and that they eagerly begin wars, but do not know how to finish them. They are likewise so presumptuous, that they think their kingdom, which is only an island, is superior to every other country. This you may judge of by the language which they have now held, and which, to the best of my power, I have answered. Adopt, therefore, my conclusion, and say that the herald of England has shown nothing with respect to pleasure, valour, or riches, which ought to induce you to advance the kingdom of England to honour, although he promised to do so ; and that the greater part of his assertions are directly contrary to himself ; but say' that, for the reasons which I have alleged, you ought to advance the kingdom of France, and place her on the right hand, in consequence of the great exploits of the kings of France, the wars of magnificence which they have made, alike in times past, middle, and present, and the several other reasons previously mentioned. You ought, indeed, to prefer and love our King who at present reigns, and advance him in the presence of Honour, and secure to him his seat ; for he has deserved well, and does not forsake the path of his noble predecessors, but follows it wisely and virtuously. And on all the

matters which have been brought forward on each side I am prepared to await a true verdict."

And hereupon the herald of France made an end of speaking.

Prudence then rose up, and after imposing silence upon the two heralds, she said to them :—
"Fair Sirs, I have listened attentively to what you have alleged on each side, and I declare that you are worthy to be heralds, and that you are very learned and skilful in your office. Each of you has argued extremely well the subject of the question which I proposed, and in a manner honourable to the kingdoms whose officers you are. I also say that the question is of general import, and one in which all Christian kings are concerned. I will, therefore, hear the heralds of other kings, some of whom have also done great actions, and made magnificent wars, especially against the Saracens, for the extension of Christianity. And since you are interested in it, Sir Heralds, I will inform you of the appointment which I make." And thereupon Prudence sat down.

Then Prudence said :—"Heralds of France and England, my decision is that you commit to writing the facts and arguments which you have alleged on each side, in answer to the question I

have proposed. From these arguments a pretty little book shall be compiled, and called 'Pastime,' which will be very profitable to young noblemen, and to all such as shall succeed you in your office; and they may pass time agreeably, and derive much benefit by the study of it. I will then consult with the readers and hearers of this book, and having listened to the heralds of other Christian kings, I will, in due time and place, deliver my sentence." *

* See Additional Note 42, p. 121.



ADDITIONAL NOTES.

NOTE 1, PAGE 5.

The Nine Worthies.

The name of Judas Maccabeus, whose exploits are related in the Apocrypha, may sound strange in these days as one of the Nine Worthies of the world ; but this was not the case prior to the Reformation. When, just before the battle of Agincourt, Sir Walter Hungerford remarked to Henry V. that it would not have been amiss if the English had had present 10,000 more stout archers, the King replied that he did not wish for one man more, and he added, in allusion to the French army : " These people put their trust in their numbers, and I in Him who so often gave victory to Judas Maccabeus."

NOTE 2, PAGE 5.

To be advanced to Honour.

The French language, by means of the verb *approcher*, has enabled the author to say, *to approach Honour*, in the sense of *to be advanced to honour*, by which means the personality of *Honour* is kept alive here, as well as in the previous sentence, and occasionally elsewhere ; but we have preferred using the English idiom *to be advanced to honour*, even at the expense of sacrificing this personality. We have done so the more readily because the author himself has not uniformly preserved the personality of *Honour*.

NOTE 3, PAGE 6.

When the Ladies go out to divert themselves.

It appears from the letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou (printed for the Camden Society, A.D. 1863), that Her Majesty was a keen sportswoman; and the following letter (p. 91), written between the years 1445 and 1455, will serve to illustrate the text:—"By the Queen. Well-beloved: Forasmuch as we know verily that our cousin, the Earl of Salisbury will be right well content and pleased that, at our resorting unto our castle of Hertford, we take our disport and recreation in his park of Ware; we, embolding us thereof, desire and pray you that the game there be spared, kept, and cherished for the same intent, without suffering any other person there to hunt or have shot, course, or other disport, in destroying or amentissment [diminution] of the game abovesaid, until such time as ye have other commandment, from our said cousin in that behalf. As we trust you, &c. To the Parker of Ware."

In the same work (p. 106) is another letter from the Queen "To the Keeper of Falkeburne park," in Essex, to the like effect; Lady Sale having granted to Her Majesty to have disport there. The statute "for Deer-hays and Buck-stalls," passed in 1503 (19 Hen. VII., c. 11), also affords information on the methods then in practice for taking deer in parks.

NOTE 4, PAGE 7.

Wild Fowl.

The abundance noticed in the text appears to have decreased during the years which followed, if we may trust the Act of Parliament passed in 1533 (24 Hen. VIII., c. 2). This Act recites that heretofore there had been "within the realm great plenty of wild fowl, as ducks, mallards, wigeons, teal, wild geese, and divers other kinds of wild fowl;" and it then prohibits the further destruction of them, with a saving to gentle-

men and forty-shilling freeholders of the right "to hunt, and take such wild fowl, with their spaniels only, without using any net or other engine for the same, except it be a long-bow."

NOTE 5, PAGE 8.

The greatest of Christian Kings.

In Sir George Mackenzie's *Tract of Precedency*, inserted in Guillim's *Heraldry* (6th ed., 1724), some observations will be found respecting the precedency of kings and commonwealths. It is a subject which was often debated in former times, and on which Germany, France, Spain, and England would have held different opinions; but it is of no practical importance at the present day. An elaborate statement of the claim of the King of France to be the first in dignity appeared during the reign of Louis XIV., in Godefroy's Appendix to Chartier's *Histoire de Charles VII.*

Between the death of Queen Elizabeth and the Revolution of 1688, with the exception of a few years in which England stood upon its feet during the Commonwealth, our country was only a power of the second order in Europe. The kingdom was prostrated, and thrown out of its rank by the vices of the Government. The English people, indeed, constantly protested against this degradation, and twice overturned the Government; but the misfortune of the displacement cannot be denied. Their protest was rendered inevitable as a consequence of all their previous history; and could we suppose it not to have been enforced, but that the Stuarts had been left to go their own way, the national character must have sunk so low, that the probability is the people of North America would now be speaking French, and the traces of the English upon that continent would be about as important as are those left by the Dutch. The wars with France under William III. and Queen Anne restored England to its former rank. What the English thought was their rightful position in Europe during the latter days of Queen

Elizabeth is shown by a passage in Stow's *Annals*, written at the time when the event which it describes happened. After the treaty of Vervins had been concluded between Spain and France, negotiations were opened for a treaty between Spain and England, in the year 1600. Spain at that time was the most powerful monarchy in Europe; and this is what took place:—"The Commissions on both sides being viewed and considered of, some question for the precedencie and superioritie of place fell into disputation and debate, her Majestie challenging the same as due unto her before the time of the Emperor Charles (as appeareth by Volateran), in the time of King Henrie the Seventh, her Highnesse' grandfather, when this selfe same difference betweene both these crownes comming into question, the Pope preferred England, and adjudged unto this crowne the most honorable place" (Stow's *Annals*, ed. 1601, p. 1307). The Spaniards, whose pride was equal to their power, contradicted this assumption, and claimed superiority; the consequence was, that the negotiation was broken off upon the point in dispute, and, in fact, a treaty was not concluded until after the accession of James I.

NOTE 6, PAGE 9.

The English readily begin Wars.

This was also the opinion of Philip de Comines, who says that, of all the nations in the world, the English were the readiest to settle their quarrels with the sword, and his judgment on their diplomacy in negotiating the terms of a peace is far from flattering (l. iii., ch. 7 & 8). With reference to the Treaty of Paris, in 1763, after the victories of the elder Pitt, Count Algarotti observed that the English "made wars like lions, and peace like lambs" (*Letters Military and Political Translated*, p. 163). Since the Revolution of 1688, however, the English have generally been more successful towards the conclusion than at the commencement of their wars.

NOTE 7, PAGE II.

Parks in England and France.

Whatever may have been the case in the fifteenth century, there can be little doubt as to the relative condition of England and France with respect to parks two centuries later. Sir John Hayward, in his *Lives of the four Norman Kings of England*, says of Henry I.:—"He permitted to make inclosures for parks, which taking beginning in his time, did rise to that excessive increase, that in a few succeeding ages more parks were in England than in all Europe beside" (p. 242). Sir John Reresby thus repeats the last assertion, in speaking of a visit which he paid to the Duke de la Tremouille, at Thouars, in Brittany, between the years 1650 and 1660:—"Going to wait on the duke, I found him very kind when I told him my country, the late Earl of Derby having married his sister. He commanded me to dine with him, and the next time mounted me upon one of his horses, to wait on him a hunting in his park, which, not being two miles about, I thought of little compass to belong to so great a person, till I found that few are allowed to have any there, save the princes of the blood; so true is it that there are more parks in England than in all Europe besides" (*Travels and Memoirs*, p. 37). The great number of parks belonging to particular noblemen and ecclesiastical dignitaries in former times is worthy of notice. Thus, in 1512, the Earl of Northumberland owned, at least, sixteen deer parks, besides forests, in Northumberland, Yorkshire, and Cumberland, in which were contained between 5,000 and 6,000 head of deer, and these were exclusive of his possessions in Sussex and other counties (*Northumberland Household Book*, p. 425). Other instances of the same kind may be found. It appears from a note in Pennant's *British Zoology* (vol. i., p. 52, ed. 1812), that "the largest park in England, about the year 1780, was that belonging to the Duke of Ancaster, at Grims-thorpe, which, it is said, contained not less than 6,000 head of fallow deer, and is annually enlarging." In Mr. Evelyn Shirley's recently-published work, *Some Account of English Deer Parks*,

full information will be found on the subject. From that work it appears that there are at present about 334 parks stocked with deer in the different counties of England.

NOTE 8, PAGE 12.

We have also Wolves and Foxes, while you have none.

Wolves appear to have been not uncommon in England in the reign of King John, but to have become gradually exterminated during the two centuries following (see Strutt's *Sports and Pastimes*, ed. 1834, p. 19). We learn, upon the authority of William of Malmesbury, that Wales was cleared of them prior to the Norman Conquest, as a consequence of the annual render of 300 wolves' skins, for which the tribute payable by the king of that country had been commuted. In the north of our island wolves existed longer, and the Parliament of Scotland, A.D. 1457, in an enactment for their destruction, enjoined, amongst other things, "that he who slew a wolf was to be entitled to a penny from every household in the parish where it was killed" (Tytler's *History of Scotland*, iii. 303, 3rd ed.).

NOTE 9, PAGE 13.

Great red-legged or Grecian Partridges.

In an additional passage by the Editor of Pennant's *British Zoology*, he says:—"The common partridge occurs nowhere in Turkey in a lower latitude than Salonica, or south of Thrace and Macedonia. The red-legged species is found throughout Greece in all the rocky districts, whether high or low, but in no other situation. . . . Red-legged partridges were introduced from France into Suffolk about the year 1770, and have multiplied considerably, particularly near Orford, and in the vicinity of the sea" (vol. i., p. 365, ed. 1812).

NOTE 10, PAGE 13.

We have likewise Pheasants, &c., while you have none.

If a passage in Stow's *Annals* can be depended upon, then, 150 years before the text was written, pheasants could not have been uncommon in England, since, under the year 1299, it is stated that by an act of the Common Council of the city of London, concerning the price of poultry, a pheasant was to be sold at fourpence, which was also the price of a goose, while a partridge was to be sold for three-halfpence (Howes's ed., p. 207). It is certain, at all events, that pheasants were common enough before the end of the fifteenth century, since this fact is sufficiently shown by the language of a statute passed in 1494 (2 Henry VII., c. 17), prohibiting the destruction of them by unlicensed persons. The sale of pheasants and partridges appears to have been first prohibited by statute 32 Henry VIII., c. 8, and the prohibition lasted down to quite recent times.

NOTE 11, PAGE 13.

Goshawks and Tercelets.

The *Paston Letters* appear to confirm the statement that in the fifteenth century England did not supply these birds for the purposes of hawking (see Knight's ed., No. 333, and the following letters), though a statute passed in 1494 (2 Henry VII., c. 17) rather points the other way. This statute, and the 35 Edw. III., c. 22, and 37 Edw. III., c. 19, contain information which anyone interested in the subject of hawking will find valuable. The tercelet, according to Turberville and Latham, was the male bird, which is less esteemed in falconry than the female. See, also, on the subject of hawking, Strutt's *Ancient Sports and Pastimes*, and a note in Sir H. Ellis's *Original Letters*, 3rd series, i. 43.

NOTE 12, PAGE 14.

King Arthur.

Although it is doubtful whether such a personage as King Arthur ever existed, yet his fame as a hero of romance was for several centuries widely spread and believed in throughout Christendom. We may refer to an early instance of this renown taken from Portuguese history. John I., being compelled to retire from the town of Coria, which he had been besieging, and being dissatisfied with the conduct of his nobility, made the remark, "We have no knights of the Round Table now; for if any had been here, we should not have raised the siege." To which one of the nobles present, stung by the reproach, boldly replied, "It is only the good King Arthur that is wanting." The English Sovereigns of the house of Tudor professed to be descended from King Arthur, and Henry VII. named his eldest son Arthur, in recognition of that supposed ancestry.

NOTE 13, PAGE 17.

*There is no other Kingdom than England which could support
such a burden.*

We do not know whether John Coke, who wrote an answer to the French *Debate* between the Heralds, was an ancestor or relative of Sir Edward Coke, the Chief Justice. It is likely, however, that the latter, who had read so much, was acquainted with the work of his namesake, as well as with that to which it is a reply. Towards the close of his life, the great English lawyer became a patriot. It was a time when the humiliation of their country brought tears into the eyes of hard men who were not accustomed to weep; and we cannot help thinking that the text supplied Sir Edward Coke with an argument which he turned to good effect. In the course of a speech against the Court party, who maintained that England and Scotland together were insufficient to defend the Protestant interest in the Palatinate, he then reminded the Government that "when poor

England stood alone, and had not the access of another kingdom, and yet had more and as potent enemies as it now hath, yet the King of England prevailed."

NOTE 14, PAGE 23.

When Princes proceed at the head of their Feudal Vassals to make Conquest, &c. (*Quant princes vont en ost conquérir*).

The expression *en ost* has a technical signification, and refers to a strictly feudal army, as contradistinguished from an army assembled under the *arrière ban*. In the former, all the feudatories who held nobly, or, as we should say in England, by knight-service, were bound to serve. In the latter force, all persons capable of bearing arms, whether noble or ignoble, were summoned to attend, and it was commonly raised in a particular district, upon the spur of the moment. The feudal army contained all the noble warriors of the province or State, and displayed

The royal banner, and all quality,
Pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war.

NOTE 15, PAGE 23.

Clovis, the first Christian King.

In England, during the reign of Henry VI., and subsequently, it was the generally received opinion, derived from Geoffrey of Monmouth's pretended history, that a certain Lucius, King of Britain, who is said to have died A.D. 156, was the first Christian king.

NOTE 16, PAGE 25.

The Dream of the Orchard (*Le Songe du Vergier*).

Although, in conformity with the modern interpretation, we have in this place given the word *orchard* as the equivalent for *vergier*, yet the French word, and probably the English one

also, formerly meant a garden. This is proved as to the French by the following passage in the commencement of the *Songe du Vergier* itself:—"Je veis un merveilleuse advision en ung Vergier que estoit trèsdéléctable et trèsbel, plein de roses et de fleurs et de plusieurs autres délitiz." With respect to the English word *orchard*, the ghost of Hamlet's father—a king, be it remembered—says,

Sleeping within mine *orchard*,
A serpent stung me.

Shakespeare probably followed the story of some more ancient author; but had he written a century later, he would in all likelihood have substituted the word *garden*. It will be observed that the Teutonic root which occurs in the word *yard*, enters both into *garden* and *orchard*. The word *vergie* occurs again in p. 79, where the sense requires it to be interpreted *garden*.

NOTE 17, PAGE 27.

Wars of Magnificence.

These wars have found greater favour with the French than with the English, and the author several times reproaches the latter with their disinclination to them. In the Crusades, however, which involved the greatest wars of magnificence ever carried on by Christendom, England performed her part: in the first Crusade, under Robert, son of William the Conqueror, and in the third, under Richard, the Lion-hearted (see Note, *supra*, p. 22); while in the last Crusade the English alone represented Europe, under their prince Edward, afterwards King Edward I. The most recent war of magnificence which the French had been engaged in at the time when the text was written, occurred during the childhood of Charles of Orleans, and it had been brought to a woeful conclusion by their defeat at Nicopolis in 1396. Henry V. of England was the last Christian king who seriously meditated a crusade against the infidels; and had he lived a few years longer, he might possibly have altered the course of modern history.

NOTE 18, PAGE 30.

King John made such great and abject submission, &c.

This discreditable business, in which King John for awhile involved the kingdom, was exceptional ; and the nobility and commonalty of England had no reason in the end to be ashamed of the part which they had taken in it. The Pope was defeated upon the two great points in controversy. He opposed Magna Charta, which the English won and secured, and the latter subsequently repudiated the homage, which, after all, had been merely nominal. A kingdom like England, which, prior to the Reformation, poured forth a continuous stream of legislation against the usurpations of the papacy, which produced Wickliffe, and which never effectually suppressed Lollardism, can hardly be charged with subserviency to Rome. In fact, the relations of this country with the Romish See were of the most independent kind prior to the Norman Conquest, and after that event they were those of a scarcely-stified Protestantism.

NOTE 19, PAGE 33.

Because, says Boetius, &c.

The only passage in the works of Boetius which we can find at all resembling the one here quoted is, *Alios in cladem meritam præcipitavit indigne aucta felicitas* (*De Consol. Phil.*, l. iv.), and wide as the translation may appear, we think it is the passage referred to. It is stated that M. Kervyn de Lettenhove has proved that Charles of Orleans made a French translation of the treatise *De Consolatione* ; and possibly from that translation the passage may be identified, or the prince may have quoted it loosely from memory.

NOTE 20, PAGE 35.^m

King John preferred rather to die or be taken prisoner.

Assuming Charles of Orleans to have been the author of the *Debate*, the passage in the text here referred to acquires a peculiar significance, since it serves to cast suspicion upon the truth of a tradition, which, we believe, will not stand the test of criticism. It is asserted that just before the battle of Agincourt, Henry V. publicly declared his determination to die in the engagement rather than to be taken prisoner; and this tradition has not only been immortalised by our poets, but it has been constantly repeated as an historical fact, from its first appearance in print in the *Polychronicon*, towards the close of the fifteenth century, down to our own days. In Hall's *Chronicle* it will be found inserted in its most expanded form. We are not aware that the tradition rests upon any contemporary authority, while it is remarkable that Harding, the Chronicler, who was himself present in the battle, makes no mention of it. Charles of Orleans was taken prisoner at Agincourt; he was introduced to Henry immediately after the battle, and remained with him until the English army recrossed the Channel, when he accompanied the King in the same ship to England. It is, therefore, impossible that such a declaration should have been publicly made and the French Prince remain in ignorance of it. Is it then probable that he would have brought forward prominently the fact that King John preferred in the alternative to die or be taken prisoner rather than to quit the field at Poitiers, when he knew that Henry V. had resolved, without any alternative, to die rather than be taken prisoner at Agincourt? The object which Charles of Orleans had in view was to show the superiority in valour of the French over the English, and surely he was not likely to have alleged an argument to which there was so obvious a reply. But the strongest objection against the truth of the tradition appears to lie in the King's own character. Henry V. was eminently a religious man, and a

Christian ; he was even called in derision, by those who did not love him, the King of the Priests. Now it was by no means a matter of course for a prince to be able to control his own fate in a battle during the middle ages. There was, then, neither the smoke nor the roar of artillery to confuse the eye and the ear ; his banner and the trappings of his steed would distinguish him, while his armour of proof would protect him against any ordinary assault ; and the object of his enemies would be not to kill him, but to take him prisoner for the sake of his ransom. Of how little avail arrows were against a knight in armour of proof may be inferred from a remark made respecting Richard I., who was said to come out of battle in the Holy Land with the arrows sticking about him like pins in a pincushion. Supposing Henry V., then, to carry out his determination to conquer or to die, the presumption is that, if he lost the battle, he would have to kill himself ; and whether such an imitation of the younger Cato would have been consistent with the Christian sentiments which Henry professed may easily be decided. The germ of the tradition appears to us to be simply a poetical invention, and to lie in a contemporary poem by John Lidgate, describing Henry's expedition into France. After relating how, just before the battle of Agincourt, the King knelt down in the midst of his soldiers, "and thrice there kissed the ground," the poet goes on to relate what next occurred :—

"Crist, seyde the knyght, as y am thi knyght,
This day me save for Ingelond sake,
And lat nevere that goode Reme for me be fright,
Ne me on lyve this day be take."

We have called attention to the determination which Henry is said to have expressed, rather than attempted formally to disprove the tradition. Even so respectable an author as De Barante has adopted the tradition as an historical truth in his *History of the Dukes of Burgundy*. As the question thus stood in our way, we could hardly avoid noticing it ; and we may here mention another tradition which the English formerly had

respecting Agincourt, and which, we suspect, was blighted when the belief in miracles began to wax cold after the Reformation :—

“ Saynt George was sene over our hoste,
Of very trouthe this syght men dyde se ;
Downe was he sente by the Holy goste,
To gyve oure Kynge the vycторыe.”

Probably the critic will find, upon investigation, that the one tradition is as credible as the other.

NOTE 21, PAGE 48.

Against the King of Granada.

In the last expedition against the King of Granada, which accomplished the destruction of the Moorish kingdom in Spain, in the year 1492, the English were represented by Lord Scales, Earl of Rivers, and a body of volunteers, who fought under his banner. A Spanish contemporary chronicler, Antonio Agapida, whose manuscript work formed the basis of Washington Irving's *Chronicle of the Conquest of Granada*, gives the following character of the Earl and his countrymen on the occasion (Bohn's ed. 1850, vol. i., p. 145) :—

“ This cavalier was from the island of England, and brought with him a train of his vassals ; men who had been hardened in certain civil wars which had raged in their country. They were a comely race of men, but too fair and fresh for warriors ; not having the sunburnt martial hue of our old Castilian soldiery. They were huge feeders, also, and deep carousers ; and could not accommodate themselves to the sober diet of our troops, but must fain eat and drink after the manner of their own country. They were often hoisy and unruly, also, in their wassail, and their quarter of the camp was prone to be a scene of loud revel and sudden brawl. They were withal of great pride ; yet it was not like our inflammable Spanish pride ; they

stood not much upon the *pundonor* and high punctilio, and rarely drew the stiletto in their disputes ; but their pride was silent and contumelious. Though from a remote and somewhat barbarous island, they yet believed themselves the most perfect men upon earth, and magnified their chieftain, the Lord Scales, beyond the greatest of our grandees. With all this, it must be said of them that they were marvellous good men in the field, dexterous archers, and powerful with the battle-axe. In their great pride and self-will, they always sought to press in the advance, and take the post of danger, trying to outvie our Spanish chivalry. They did not rush forward fiercely, or make a brilliant onset, like the Moorish and Spanish troops, but they went into the fight deliberately, and persisted obstinately, and were slow to find out when they were beaten. Withal they were much esteemed, yet little liked by our soldiery, who considered them staunch companions in the field, yet coveted but little fellowship with them in the camp.

“ Their commander, the Lord Scales, was an accomplished cavalier, of gracious and noble presence, and fair speech. It was a marvel to see so much courtesy in a knight brought up so far from our Castilian court. He was much honoured by the King and Queen, and found great favour with the fair dames about the court, who, indeed, are rather prone to be pleased with foreign cavaliers. He went always in a costly state, attended by pages and esquires, and accompanied by noble young cavaliers of his country, who had enrolled themselves under his banner, to learn the gentle exercise of arms. In all pageants and festivals, the eyes of the populace were attracted by the singular bearing and rich array of the English Earl and his train, who prided themselves on always appearing in the garb and manner of their country ; and were indeed something very magnificent, delectable, and strange to behold.”

We have not verified this extract with the original Spanish, since Agapida's work still remains in manuscript. We have, however, compared the account of the exploits of the Earl of Rivers at the capture of Loja with the chronicle of Bernaldez, curate of Los Palacios, which Irving also quotes in manuscript—

the latter work having since been published (Granada, 1850)—and we have found it, as far as it goes, confirming the statements both of Agapida and Washington Irving.

NOTE 22, PAGE 52.

You are obliged to warm yourselves and cook your food with Coal.

This is an interesting fact, and taken in connection with two subsequent passages on the same subject (p. 63 and 81), tends to show that the use of coal was common in England earlier than is generally supposed. Bishop Fleetwood doubts whether sea-coal, as distinguished from charcoal, was commonly used in London earlier than in the middle of the sixteenth century (*Chronicon Preciosum*, p. 118); and MacCulloch merely states that, "in the reign of Charles I. the use of coal became universal in London" (*Dict. of Commerce*, 1859, p. 301). On the other hand, a statute passed in 1421 (9 Hen. V., c. 10), proves that the Newcastle trade in coal must have been considerable, or Parliament would hardly have interfered to stop a fraud amounting to only fourpence, or at most sixpence, in the custom due for each keel laden with coals. We also learn that the cost of coal consumed in the household of the Earl of Northumberland, A.D. 1512, was more than double the cost of all other fuel, including charcoal, faggots, and great wood (*Northumb. Household Book*, p. 21). Unless London, therefore, was an exception to the general rule, there is reason for believing that coal was commonly used in that city nearly a century before the time mentioned by Bishop Fleetwood. The use of charcoal in the manufacture of iron was checked by "an Act that timber shall not be felled to make coals for the burning of iron," passed in 1559; and the object of the statute is stated to be "for the avoiding of destruction and wasting of timber." We have no doubt that if the old statutes, not printed in the *Statutes at Large*, were looked into, they would afford further information of value on the subject of the early use of coal in England.

NOTE 23, PAGE 56.

Maritime Law of War.

The ancient sea-laws of Oléron are probably the maritime law here referred to, specimens of which celebrated code the English reader will find in the *Rutter of the Sea*, printed by Petit in 1536, and in the Appendix to Godolphin's *Admiralty Jurisdiction*. These laws were formerly regarded with much favour in England, in consequence of its being supposed that they were ordained by our Richard I. in the Holy Land. The general maritime law of Europe in the middle ages is rather a wide subject, which may be studied with advantage in the very learned work by Pardessus, *Collection des Lois Maritimes antérieures au XVIII. siècle* (Paris, 1828-45). We have not been successful in finding the particular law referred to in the text.

NOTE 24, PAGE 56.

Portugal your Ally.

There is hardly another instance to be found of so enduring an alliance between two independent nations as that which has existed between Portugal and England. It may be said, indeed, to date from the origin of Portugal as a kingdom in the twelfth century, when the Christian inhabitants, who rescued their country from the Moors, are reported to have been aided by some English crusaders returning from the Holy Land. In the fourteenth century the English, under John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, contributed again to the establishment of the independence of the kingdom, when it was menaced by the Castilians; and John I. of Portugal married Philippa of Lancaster, the daughter of that prince. The English princess gave birth to five sons, amongst whom we recognise the familiar names of her native land, Edward and Henry; and it was under the fostering care of the prince of this latter name, so well known

as the Infante Don Henry, that the Portuguese commenced those famous maritime expeditions, which, before his death, had added the islands of Madeira, the Azores, and the Cape de Verd to the dominions of Portugal; and which led, before the fifteenth century was ended, to the discovery of America by Columbus, and of the sea-passage to India, by Portugal's own hero, Vasco da Gama. In the year 1455 we find King Alfonso V., the grandson of Philippa of Lancaster, elected a Knight of the Garter in England (*Fœdera*, vol. xi., p. 368), a barren honour it may be, yet not without its import as evincing the kindly relations existing between the two countries. It is pleasing to reflect upon the fact which the text reveals, that about the same time, when England was greatly depressed, struggling against powerful adversaries, and without any other help in Europe, she was befriended in turn by her prosperous and faithful ally. In the sixteenth century Spain, having become consolidated, was the foremost power of Christendom; and being strengthened by her connection with Germany, overmatched and conquered Portugal, while England had enough to do in maintaining her own position against the combined forces which the religious changes of the period had brought against her. Yet even then, after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, England's first thoughts were turned towards her early ally, and the government of Elizabeth despatched an expedition to the Peninsula for recovering the independence of Portugal, and setting Don Antonio upon the throne. Again, in the seventeenth century, no sooner had the Portuguese themselves re-established their independence under the house of Braganza, than the ancient alliance with England was renewed, and our Charles II. married the Infanta Catherine. To that marriage the English are in a great measure indebted for their dominion in India, which constitutes their chief glory in the eyes of foreign nations. The war of the Spanish Succession, and the Methuen Treaty at the commencement of the eighteenth century, afford further proof of the heartiness of the attachment between the two kingdoms. And when, in the year 1755, the great national calamity of the

earthquake destroyed Lisbon, there was a general outburst of sympathy throughout England; which did not waste itself in words, but the British Parliament immediately voted one hundred thousand pounds, to be expended in corn and provisions for the relief of the surviving inhabitants. The Portuguese character was shown to advantage when these supplies reached Lisbon, and the King of Portugal spontaneously provided that the British residents who had suffered in common with his own subjects should be preferred in the distribution. Only a few years afterwards, when the Family Compact was signed between the Kings of France and Spain, Portugal again, with remarkable courage, stood forth as the friend of England, and suffered invasion for her sake. In the early part of the present century, England threw her utmost strength into the alliance, in order to liberate Portugal; and the two nations fought side by side throughout the Peninsular war. Subsequently, in 1826, after the Spanish constitution had been trampled out under the hoofs of the French invasion, and when the constitution of Portugal was threatened by Spain and the Absolutist powers of Europe, England dispatched troops to Lisbon to defend the Government of her ally. The duty of England towards the kingdom which has stood up so manfully on her side in every period of our history was then proclaimed by Mr. Canning in his famous speech justifying the wisdom of that measure:—"While Great Britain has an arm to raise, it must be raised against the efforts of any Power that shall attempt forcibly to control the choice and fetter the independence of Portugal." There is something honourable to human nature in the fact of a friendship which has lasted more than six hundred years, and which has been cemented by so many benefits mutually conferred and received; and we trust it may be long before England ceases to interest herself in the welfare of Portugal, her oldest and most constant ally.

NOTE 25, PAGE 57.

The Cross-bow.

The English obstinately persisted in the use of the long-bow after the superior efficiency of other weapons of destruction had been proved. Amongst the Continental nations, there was a period between the disuse of the long-bow and the introduction of the hand-gun, or arquebuss, when the cross-bow had been extensively employed, but it was never popular in England. An Act was passed in 1503 (18 Hen. VII., c. 4), the title of which is, "No man shall shoot in a cross-bow without the King's license, except he be a lord, or have two hundred mark land;" and in 1511 this Act was confirmed and rendered more stringent. On the other hand, the Acts passed for the encouragement of shooting with the long-bow were of constant recurrence down to 1565 (8 Eliz., c. 10). Soon after this date, however, the merits of the cross-bow forced themselves upon the attention of the English Government. Still, so late as the year 1590, an experienced soldier, Sir John Smythe, in his treatise *Concerning the Forms and Effects of divers sorts of Weapons*, holds to the opinion that the long-bow was the better weapon for Englishmen; and this opinion found favour in England down to the time of the civil wars under Charles I. It is shown by Rymer, however (*Fædera*, viii. 477), that in the year 1406, before any kind of hand-guns had been invented, the English used cannon on board their ships.

NOTE 26, PAGE 58.

For there is Danger, &c.

The reasons here alleged are so curious that we add the original passage:—"Car il ya dangier et perdicion de vie, et dieu sceit quelle pitié quant il fait tourmente, and si est la maladie de la mer forte à endurer à plusieurs gens. Item et la dure vie dont il fault viure qui n'est pas bien consonante à noblesse."

NOTE 27, PAGE 59.

The King is also lord of Genoa.

The republic of Genoa, after recovering its liberties in 1435, became a prey to intestine divisions and foreign wars, and voluntarily submitted to the dominion of the King of France in 1458. On the 11th May in this latter year, John of Anjou was admitted into possession of the city, after swearing to protect the rights and liberties of the citizens; but the French were expelled and lost their sovereignty in 1461. The passage in the text must therefore have been written during their three years' occupation of the city (Sismondi, *Hist. des Républ. Italiennes*, x. 74).

NOTE 28, PAGE 61.

Great Towns.

The general state of insecurity which prevailed in the thirteenth century is shown by a statute passed in 1285 (13 Edw. I., c. 4), for keeping watch in great towns which were walled. It is probable that at that period husbandmen resided chiefly in walled towns, and if such were the fact, the populous villages mentioned in the text afford evidence of the advancement in civilisation which had since taken place.

NOTE 29, PAGE 63.

Mines of Metal.

The original is *minières de métal*, and we suspect that this last word is a typographical error. It looks very much like *mézel*, an old word which Cotgrave translates, "a kind of brass or copper, good to make ordnance of;" but whether or not copper was the metal intended, we cannot venture to decide.

NOTE 30, PAGE 68.

*In England there are only Fourteen Bishops and Two
Archbishops.*

If we exclude the Welsh bishoprics, and the bishopric of Sodor and Man, this will be found to be a correct enumeration of English sees in the fifteenth century. To these sees then and now existing, five were added after the dissolution of the monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII., and two more in the present reign. The Isle of Man, having been rendered virtually independent of England after the grant of that island by Henry IV. to the Stanley family, and the struggle of Wales for independence under the same sovereign, might be the reason for the author's omission of the sees which have been excluded.

NOTE 31, PAGE 68.

We have Seven Universities.

The loose confederation of provinces which succeeded the Heptarchy, and became subject to the Anglo-Saxon monarchy, was consolidated into one homogeneous kingdom, governed by the same laws, under the reign of William the Conqueror. From that time forward the universities of Oxford and Cambridge would suffice for the whole of England, and, in fact, they have helped to preserve the unity of the State. In France it was otherwise. There the union of the provinces was not effected until four hundred years later, and in the meantime an extensive province would require a university for itself. Thus the greater number of universities in France sprang out of a condition of affairs which has always been regarded as one of the chief misfortunes of that realm.

NOTE 32, PAGE 70.

If you have been in France.

The author seems to have forgotten himself here, since we must presume that he meant to lay the scene of the debate between the two heralds in France, as the French herald says (p. 28), "I, who am speaking, have been in England." Another defect of memory of the same kind occurs in p. 19, where the French herald says that the Saxons were invited to *come* (venir) over, not to *go* (aller) over, and make war in Britain. Or, do not these and some other passages raise a suspicion that they were actually written in England, although the *Debate* as a whole in its present form was not finished until the year 1458? How a public man may be delayed in completing an historical work is shown, in his *Historical Characters*, by Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer, who informs us that his sketch of Mr. Canning was written twenty-six years before it was published.

NOTE 33, PAGE 73.

• *It must be admitted, &c.*

The reasons here alleged to prove the early origin of the French nobility would hardly be put forward by a modern Frenchman, looking back upon the wars of the Revolution. The argument expressed in its full terms is as follows:—

Every nation which carries on war must possess a great nobility.

But the French nation did carry on war against Brutus.

Therefore, the French nation must then have possessed a great nobility, which has lasted down to the present time.

This specimen of reasoning is certainly curious, since it will be observed that both of the premises are false; and even admitting them to be true, the conclusion does not follow from them.

NOTE 34, PAGE 75.

For every Castle that you have, we have fifty.

The best answer to this fact, if such it be, is contained in the patriotic little poem of Sir William Jones, the distinguished Oriental scholar :—

“ What constitutes a State ?

Not high-raised battlement, or laboured mound,
Thick wall, or moated gate.

* . * * * . *

No ; men, high-minded men ;—

Men who their duties know,

But know their rights ; and knowing, dare maintain.”

Forty-nine castles only are enumerated in Domesday Book, but there can be no doubt that a very great number of castles for defence formerly existed in England, built during the reign of the Conqueror and his successors of the Norman line. During the three centuries which followed, a large proportion of these castles must have fallen into decay, or been destroyed. We have, however, within a short compass, some authentic and valuable information respecting the state of landed property in England, in the statute of *Extenta Manerii*, passed in the year 1276, about midway between the Norman Conquest and the accession of the House of Tudor ; and this proves that the castles of the nobility were even then of great consideration. On the other hand, in the century preceding the date of the text, many new castles were built, for the double purpose of defence and convenient habitation, by the fortunate soldiers who had grown rich from the spoils gathered in the wars with France. During the wars of the Roses, not so many castles were demolished as might have been expected, it being the practice of the English of that day to fight battles in the field, and not to allow the war to linger by the besieging of castles. The Tudor sovereigns did not encourage the building of castles ; the em-

ployment of artillery in war was now becoming general, and the fortifications which a private man could raise were not of much avail against the assaults of gunpowder, while the state of internal security had become improved, and a new style of architecture for domestic purposes came into use. Had Wolsey lived in the time of Anselm, he would not have built a palace at Hampton Court, but a castle. Nearly the last of the castles erected in England was the ostentatious structure erected in place of the old castle of Kenilworth, and which was built by Queen Elizabeth's favourite, the Earl of Leicester. In the civil war under Charles I., it must have been obvious to the popular party, that the owners of castles would, in the long run, adhere to the opposite side, and hence, about the year 1648, began the great demolition of feudal castles throughout the kingdom. It will be seen from Bishop Percy's additions to the *Northumberland Household Book*, that the castles of the Earl of Northumberland of that day were not spared, although he belonged to the Parliamentary party. Since then the residences of the nobility in England have lost the distinctive features which rendered them places of refuge in the turbulent times of feudalism. In Dallaway's *Discourses upon Architecture in England* will be found an interesting account of several of the old castles in this country.

NOTE 35, PAGE 77..

Your Beer and good Ale. .

It is evident from the *Northumberland Household Book* that beer brewed in England with hops was in common use in 1512. It even appears some years earlier to have formed an article of export, since in the *Fædera* (vol. xii., p. 471) we find, under the year 1492, a license to a Flemish merchant to purchase in England, and export fifty tuns of beer (*quingaginta dolia serviciæ vocatæ bere*). Hence Sir Richard Baker, in his *Chronicle* (ed. 1730, p. 298), gives currency to an inaccurate tradition, when he reports that, about the year 1524, "divers

things were newly brought into England, whereupon this rhyme was made :—

‘Turkeys, carps, piccarel, and beer,
Came into England all in one year.’ ”

The original expression in the text is *vos ceruoysses et vos godale* ; and if this word *ceruoysses* means beer made with hops, then it is, perhaps, the earliest authority known for the brewing of that beverage in England. It is true that in our common Statute Book the expression “ beer or ale ” occurs in the translation of statutes passed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, but this is merely a rendering of the word “ cervisia,” which then meant ale exclusively. From a poem written between the years 1416 and 1438, and inserted in Hakluyt’s *Voyages* (i. 192), it appears that Prussia was the country from which beer was then imported into England.

The word *godale* appears to have been formerly admitted into the French language, since Froissard (ed. 1559, ch. 61, p. 76), employs it in the sentence *Allez boire vostre godale, allez* ; which Colonel Johnes translates, “ Go your ways, and drink your good ale.”

Fleetwood’s *Chronicon Preciosum* shows that, A.D. 1459, common ale was sold at the rate of a penny the gallon (p. 111) ; and further, that in a year of great scarcity, ale of three degrees of strength—good ale, the better sort, and the best of all—was sold respectively at 2*d.*, 3*d.*, and 4*d.* the gallon (p. 91).

NOTE 36, PAGE 81.

Limestone Quarries.

We have thus ventured to translate *rimieres* (sic) *de pleastre*, not knowing whether the former word is a misprint for *mînières* or *carrières*. Plaster of Paris, supposing it to be represented by *pleastre*, is gypsum reduced to a powder, and formed into a paste with water. As it is questionable, however, whether salt-

petre or nitre is ever found in combination with gypsum, while it is certainly collected from limestone, we believe that we have given the author's true meaning.

NOTE 37, PAGE 84.

*France * * enjoys a peculiar excellence.*

This pleasing description of the natural advantages of France is also just, though it must at the same time be admitted that the inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland have not been left without ample compensation. It may be very well for foreigners to say that the excitement of political controversy is necessary on this side the Channel in order to render life endurable; but though other climes may be warmed by a brighter sun, and fanned with breezes from a serener sky, yet the native of these isles, when he returns home to his own country, must be blind if he fails to perceive in it another kind of beauty which all nations have admitted to exist in full perfection there, and which,

Making a sunshine in the shady place,

leaves him, after all, without dissatisfaction and without envy.

Setting aside, however, the natural advantages of France, and coming to the question whether the people lived pleasantly, Fortescue proves conclusively that, at the very time when the author of the *Debate* was making this boast, the main body of the people were reduced to the most abject condition of servitude, destitution, and misery which the imagination can conceive (*Abs. and Lim. Mon.*, ch. 3).

•

NOTE 38, PAGE 86.

You Killed and Murdered King Richard, &c.

Richard II. was abroad fighting in Ireland when Henry of Lancaster, afterwards Henry IV., landed at Ravenspur, in Yorkshire, and headed a successful insurrection against him.

“ When King Richard heard tell all this, he came in haste out of Ireland into Wales, and abode in the castle of Flint, to take counsel what to do, but no counsel came to him ; and all his host landed in divers parts, and would not follow him. Then Sir Thomas Percy, steward of the King’s house, brake the rod of his office in the hall before all men, and said, ‘ The King will no longer hold household ;’ and anon all the King’s men forsook him, and left him alone. Then cursed the King the untruth of England, and said, ‘ Alas ! what trust is in this false world ’ ” (*English Chronicle of the Reign of Richard II.*, written before the year 1471. Printed for the Camden Society). With respect to the death of Richard, Sir John Hayward makes a judicious remark :—“ It was not amiss, in regard of the Commonwealth, that he was dead ; yet they who caused his death had small reason to reckon it among their good deeds ” (*Life of Henry IV.*, p. 136). It is observable that Richard II., and his predecessor, Edward II., who were deposed, and met with violent deaths, each married a French princess named Isabella.

If it be admitted that Charles of Orleans wrote the *Debate between the Heralds*, then the importance of the passage from the text here referred to cannot be over-rated in its bearing upon the question of the murder of Richard II., a fact which has been denied by Scotch historians, and notably by Mr. Tytler. As we shall have to employ the passage for another purpose, we do not feel called upon here to discuss the subject of Richard’s death. The argument upon that point will be sufficiently apparent after a perusal of our *Inquiry into the authorship of the Debate*. With reference to that *Inquiry*, although the statement may be of no value in the way of proof, we owe it to the reader to inform him that we came to the conclusion that Charles of Orleans was the author, by means of a comparison between the whole body of his poetry and the *Debate* itself, before a line of the *Inquiry* was written, as well as before we had been struck by the evidence which the passage from the text affords of the authorship.

NOTE 39, PAGE 86.

He has a just right to go and fetch his Subjects.

This passage shows that so late as the year 1458 there were French prisoners still in England, some of whom may possibly have been detained since the battle of Agincourt, more than forty years previously. Charles, Duke of Orleans, who was made prisoner in that battle, lingered twenty-five years in captivity, and he has left us an account of what he suffered. "I know," he says, "from my own experience, during my imprisonment in England, that by reason of the annoyances, the troubles, and the dangers I met with, I often wished that I had died in the battle when I was taken prisoner, in order to be relieved from the sufferings which I endured" (Champollion-Figeac, *Louis et Charles, Ducs d'Orléans*, p. 377).

NOTE 40, PAGE 87.

Tree of Battle.

It may be observed that the author of the *Debate* has referred to several distinct works :—

1. *The Triumph of the Nine Worthies*, p. 5.
2. *The Brut*, p. 20.
3. *The Book on Falconry*, by the Count de Foix, p. 10.
4. Master Brunet's *Treasure of Sapience*, p. 25.
5. *The Dream of the Orchard*, p. 25.
6. Boetius (*De Consolatione*), p. 33.
7. *The Tree of Battle*, p. 86.

M. le Roux de Lincy has published a list of the books formerly in the library of Charles of Orleans (Paris : Didot, 1843). We have not met with a copy of this list ; and, as books were scarce before the invention of printing, it would be worth knowing, with reference to the authorship of the *Debate*, whether the whole or most of the works above mentioned were in the Prince's possession.

NOTE 41, PAGE 88.

There is a certain Nobleman in France, &c.

The French nobleman here alluded to was probably the Count Dunois, the illegitimate brother of Charles, Duke of Orleans, and the successful opponent of the English. Dunois was a gallant and fortunate soldier; but the combinations necessary for an invasion of England lay beyond his genius, and the threat in the text is a mere flourish. Besides, when the parties of the White and Red Roses were beginning to slaughter each other, with all the ferocity which the most patriotic Frenchman could desire, it would not have been wise, by an ill-timed attempt at invasion, to stop the civil war, and unite both Yorkists and Lancastrians against the common enemy.

NOTE 42, PAGE 91.

At the end of the original French tract which we have translated is published the first edition of Villon's patriotic ballad, having at the end of every stanza the line, *Qui mal voudroit au royaume de France*. This edition of the ballad has not been seen by any one of that poet's editors; and it will clear up some difficulties which have puzzled them.



An Inquiry into the Authorship
of the French Tract entitled
“The Debate between the
Heralds, &c.”



An Inquiry into the Authorship
of the French Tract entitled
“The Debate between the
Heralds, &c.”



ALTHOUGH the intrinsic merit of the “Debate between the Heralds of France and England” may be sufficient to warrant the publication of that work in English, yet since its value as an historical authority will be more precisely determined if the author of it can be discovered, the following observations have been brought together for the purpose of solving the question.

The existence of the “Debate” appears to have been lost sight of since the time when the Tudors were upon the throne of England, and as no reference to the authorship can be traced in the

literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; it becomes necessary to resort to the only kind of evidence the case admits of, and to seek the author through the agency of the information which he has himself been pleased to communicate. With this view, it will be desirable to indicate at the outset the primary qualifications which must belong to every candidate who can be proposed to fill the vacancy.

I. A perusal of the "Debate" will lead without difficulty to the conclusion, that the writer of it must have been a Frenchman of rank and talent, a scholar, and possessed of a lively imagination. Amidst the troubles to which his country was a prey during the civil wars of the fifteenth century, he had probably belonged to the Orleanist, or national party, since he scarcely alludes to the existence of any other, and particular passages of his work, as well as its general tone, are consistent only with this assumption. Although a Frenchman, and writing in France, he had previously resided in England;* and his accurate and minute knowledge of the affairs of the latter kingdom tends to show that his residence there had not been one of brief duration. He must

* "I who am speaking have been in England," says the French herald (p. 28), who manifestly represents the author himself.

have written in the period between 1453 and 1461, because he mentions the defeat of the English under Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, and their subsequent loss of Bourdeaux (p. 46), both of which events happened in the former year; and he describes Charles VII., who died in the latter year, as being, at the time when he wrote, the reigning King of France (pp. 44 and 46). The date of the work is therefore fixed at once within narrow limits. It is also stated that the King of France is lord of Genoa (p. 59); and as he did not become so until the year 1458, we are able to contract those limits still further.* More than forty years must consequently have elapsed between the recommencement of the war between France and England in 1415, and the time when the "Debate" was written. During the whole of that period there had been no cessation of the contest, and no distinguished Frenchman of the national party could have dwelt long in England except as a prisoner. But the greater part of the French prisoners of rank detained in this country were those taken at the battle of Agincourt; hence a suspicion is raised that the author may have been one of them.

* If the point were worth arguing, it might, we think, be proved that the *Debate* in its present form was completed during the twelve-month between July 1458 and 1459.

Such are the reflections which occur upon a simple perusal of the "Debate;" but there are other indications of authorship, more significant and less obvious, which will demand notice subsequently. In the meantime, we may look amongst the prisoners captured at Agincourt for some one sufficiently qualified for our present purpose.

Monstrelet* states that these prisoners comprised about 1,500 lords and gentlemen; and he gives a list of between twenty and thirty of the most considerable of them, commencing with the princes of the blood. The first name which presents itself is that of Charles, Duke of Orleans, the grandson of Charles V. and father of Louis XII., Kings of France; and this name will immediately arrest attention, since it belonged to a prince of ability, who was also a scholar and a poet. Before proceeding further, it will be proper to consider whether he fulfils the other conditions which have been pointed out as necessarily belonging to the authorship of the "Debate." Born at Paris, in the year 1391, he passed in France the first twenty-four years of his life, until, fighting at Agincourt, he was wounded and taken prisoner, and conveyed to England, where he spent the ensuing quarter of a century in exile. Upon the recovery of his liberty, in the year 1440, he

* Monstrelet, edited by Buchon (*Panthéon Littéraire*, 1836), p. 380.

returned to his native country, and lived during the remainder of his days almost wholly at Blois ; and in his palace there he assembled around him a society of literary men, whom he presided over, and was at once their ornament and patron. He survived his sovereign and cousin, Charles VII., and died at the age of seventy-four, in the year 1465. We have now, then, before us a personage who, according to present appearances, may "possibly have been the author of the "Debate." By instituting a comparison between the known productions of his genius and the "Debate" itself, we shall be advancing towards a solution of the question, whether he was or was not the author whom we are seeking.

II. The principal work which Charles of Orleans has left to posterity is a volume of short but delightful poems, inspired almost exclusively by the passion of love. Notwithstanding their literary excellence, these poems were hardly known during the interval between his decease and the commencement of the present century, and the poet has since been reproached for spending his time idly in composing love verses, instead of attending to the great business of his country. A modern editor of his poetical works * appears

* M. Guichard ; Introduction, p. xxiii.

to think, that provided a poet writes good poetry, this is all which can be required from him, and that in other respects he may do or leave undone very much what he pleases, and that any defence of his conduct is superfluous. Another editor* has made an attempt to defend the Prince against the charge of a total want of patriotism, by referring to his poem entitled, "The Complaint of France,"† which contains more of his ideas respecting the kingdom than all the rest of his poems combined, and which we shall presently have occasion to consider.

Upon a comparison of the poems in general with the "Debate," it will be found that, although such dissimilar subjects could scarcely be expected to present points of correspondence, yet the same ideas and characteristic forms of expression occur in both; there are the same measure and kind of superstition, the same narrowness of sympathy, and the same simplicity of unconsciousness that

* M. Champollion-Figeac; *Préface*, p. xvii. Both of these editions of the Prince's poems appeared in 1842; a previous incomplete edition having been published at Grenoble in 1808. An ancient English version of most of the poems was printed for the Roxburgh Club in 1827. An elegant modern translation of a few of the poems will be found in Longfellow's *Poets and Poetry of Europe*.

† *La Complainte de France*. Neither editor, however, has noticed the fact, that this poem was suggested to Charles of Orleans by a previously-written ballad with nearly the same title (see *Poésies d'Eustace Deschamps*, p. 44). The first verse of the Prince's poem bears too close a resemblance to the earlier ballad to have been accidental.

the French commonalty could ever be brought to stand alone without leaning upon the nobility. There are also in the “Debate” passages near akin to poetry, and a slight trace of the melancholy which sometimes clouded the bright spirit of Charles of Orleans, when he made allusion to France in the songs of his captivity. If we seek for further resemblances, there will be discovered, both in the poetry and in the prose, signs of a predilection for personifying moral qualities, and for employing proverbial and legal expressions.* A complete examination of the poems, with a view to point out in detail the instances of their agreement with the “Debate,” would carry us beyond reasonable limits, and will not be attempted. Instead of this, our course must be to return to “The Complaint of France,” to take and analyse that poem, and see what it will yield. It consists of ten stanzas, and four of these† are distinct

* The happy manner in which legal terms are introduced into the poems has been noticed by M. Champollion-Figeac (Préface, p. xvii.). The technical propriety with which legal terms are used in the *Debate* is equally noticeable.

† They comprise the four middle stanzas, which are the following:—

Souviengne-toy comment¹ vould ordonner
Que tu criasses : Mon joye ! par liesse !
Et qu'en escu d'azur deusses porter •
Trois fleurs de lis d'or ; et pour ardiessse
Fermer en toy t'envoya sa haultesse

¹ *Dieu* is here understood.

from all the others, inasmuch as they celebrate the earlier glories of France ; they treat of the miracles wrought by God in her favour, of the services rendered by her to the Holy See, and of the honours conferred upon her in return, as well

L'auriflamme, qui t'a fait seigneurir
 Tes ennemis. Ne metz en oubliance
 Telz dons haultains, dont lui pleut t'enrichir,
 Très crestien, franc Royaume de France.

Et oultre plus, te voulu envoyer,
 Par ung coulomb, qui est plain de simplesse,
 La unccion dont dois tes rois sacrer ;
 Afin qu'en eulx dignité plus en cresse,
 Et plus qu'à nul t'a voulu sa richesse
 De reliques et corps saints départir.
 Tout le monde en a la congnoissance :
 Soyés certain qu'il ne se veult faillir,
 Très crestien, franc Royaume de France.

Court de Romme, si te fait appeller
 Son bras destre, car souvent de destresse
 L'a mise hors. Et pour ce approuver,
 Les papes font te séoir seul sans presse
 A leur destre ; ce droit jamais ne cesse,
 Et pour ce, dois fort plourer et gémir
 Quant tu desplais à Dieu, que tant t'avance
 En tous Estats, leque' deusse chérir,
 Très crestien, franc Royaume de France.

Quelz champions souloit en toy trouver
 Crestienté : ja ne fault que l'expresse ;
 Charlemaine, Roland et Olivier
 En sont tesmoings, pour ce je m'en délaïsse,
 Et Saint-Loys roy, qui fist la rudesse
 Des Sarrasins souvent anéantir
 En son vivant, par travail et vaillance
 Les croniques le monstrent, sans mentir,
 Très crestien, franc Royaume de France.

as of the fame which has accrued to her from the achievements of her heroic sons; but what renders these stanzas chiefly valuable in the present inquiry is, that they deal for the most part with actual persons and material things. We are thus in a condition to descend from the spirit to the letter, and to trace the concordance between the persons and things mentioned in this particular poem and in the "Debate." The four selected stanzas, it will be seen, refer to the following subjects:—

1. The Fleurs-de-lis, formerly in the arms of France.
2. The Oriflamme, or sacred banner of France.
3. The Ampulla, containing the holy oil with which the kings of France were anointed at their coronation.
4. The relics in the churches of France.
5. The bodies of six of the Apostles in the church of Toulouse, which, by reason of their importance, are separately mentioned.
6. The material assistance rendered by France to the See of Rome.
7. The seat of honour on the Pope's right hand, granted to the kings of France.
8. Charlemagne.
9. Roland.
10. Oliver.
11. St. Louis.
12. The Saracens defeated by the French.
13. The Chronicles, or historical books, in which the exploits of the French are recorded.
14. The "free" realm of France.

Of the fourteen subjects here enumerated, and

which are brought forward in the poem to illustrate the superiority of France, every one of them, with but a single exception, is adduced for the same purpose in the "Debate;"* and although St. Louis—the exception referred to—is not mentioned by name in the latter work, yet he and Charlemagne are the kings there meant as having diligently collected relics, and put them out of the power of the infidels (p. 70). "The Complaint of France," it will be observed, is not a poem taken by choice out of hundreds of others of the same kind, but it is the only one of a political character Charles of Orleans has left on record, if we exclude a short ballad, which he composed upon the expulsion of the English from Guienne and Normandy, in 1453. This ballad treats of moral qualities, infinitely varying with opinion or imagination, and not of material things, and therefore it is incapable of being subjected to the same severe test which has been applied to the former poem; but the tone of it

* Compare No. 1, 2 and 3 with page 23 and 24

"	4 and 5	"	69
"	6	"	25
"	7	"	8
"	8	"	25
"	9 and 10	"	27
"	11	"	70
"	12 and 13	"	27
"	14	"	31

is in accordance with that of the narrative of the same events in the "Debate."* The ballad, however, will again be referred to in the sequel.

Now, it is inconceivable that such a long series of verbal and actual coincidences as have just been pointed out between four consecutive stanzas of a single poem and the "Debate" should occur accidentally. "The Complaint of France" is expressed† and admitted to have been composed by its author during his residence in England, which terminated in the year 1440; and the "Debate" is shown to have been written between the years 1458 and 1461.‡ It is, therefore, certain that the author of the "Debate" must either have been acquainted with the poem, or there must have been two writers both drawing their materials from a common source, which could only have been in manuscript, because the art of printing was not introduced into France before the year 1469 or 1470. Which of these two alternative propositions is more likely to be the true one, if we look at the special character of

* M. Guichard has incorporated in his edition of the poems of Charles of Orleans the compositions of several contemporary versifiers. A comparison of these compositions with the *Debate*, by reason of their dissimilarity in thought, style, and language, will place in the strongest light the resemblances which we have noticed in the text.

† In the last stanza of the poem.

‡ *Supra*, p. 127.

the subjects introduced, it requires no argument to prove.

As the person to whom the poetical works of Charles of Orleans were best known would be the Prince himself, and as it has been shown that he was otherwise qualified to write the "Debate," we now obtain a certain degree of probability that he was really the author of it. But a new question here arises. Might not some member of the literary circle assembled round the Prince have imbibed his opinions, and possessing the advantage of information derived from him, together with access to his works, have been the author? It would be a sufficient answer to this suggestion, to show that the "Debate" is so thoroughly interpenetrated with the ideas and expressions prevalent throughout the whole body of the Prince's poetry, as to leave no room for doubt that the author of the one and of the other must have been the same person. But to do this would be a long task; and the variety of details which it must involve would prove intolerably wearisome to any ordinary reader. It will, therefore, be desirable to attain an equivalent result by means of a different process, and to bring the pretensions of any competitor for the authorship to the test of a single fact. With this view, we shall endeavour to

elicit from the "Debate" itself a conclusion that the author of it was not simply a Frenchman of rank, but that he was furthermore a prince of the royal family.

"III. Any French writer in the fifteenth century, who was adverse to England, might be expected to extol the kings of France; and hence there is nothing remarkable, when the author of the "Debate" assures us that they are the greatest of Christian kings, and take the right hand in preference to all other kings (p. 8); that they have been always perfect in the law of God without swerving from it (p. 28); and that all the infidels say that the King of France is the great king of the Christians (p. 28). He might also add, without flattering the kings of France, that, from respect for the royal dignity, he was ashamed to declare what abject submission was made to the Pope's legate by King John of England (p. 30). But he proceeds further than this, when he asserts that King John of France gained marvellous great honour by the battle of Poitiers (p. 35); and when he endeavours to exalt the royal line, by affirming that Charlemagne, Louis VIII., before he came to the throne, and Isabella of France, who married the English Edward II., each conquered England (pp. 37-8). So also he treads upon

dangerous ground when he states, that because God wrought miracles in favour of Clovis, therefore all mortal men are perpetually bound to pay honour to that king, and to all his posterity and race (p. 24); for he has overlooked the broken succession, and the divine right of kings which is here inculcated, though it may have been a belief which had its use in a barbarous age, has proved upon the whole less advantageous to kingdoms than to their rulers. With regard to the duty of princes towards their subjects, the author, as might have been expected, is silent; but he has taken care to announce that "God sometimes punishes the people for disobedience to their king" (p. 33). These instances will be sufficient to show that the author was a zealous royalist. But his royalism is peculiarly French; since there is observable throughout the "Debate" a characteristic difference between the heralds of England and France in this respect, that the former of them generally attributes the successes of his country to the English as a nation, while the latter ascribes the glories of his to the kings of France.

In spite of his natural bent, however, the author does not appear to be animated by any spirit of obsequiousness or servility, since the language of the French herald, which may be taken

to represent the author's own sentiments, is uniformly elevated to a higher pitch of independence than any actual herald would have ventured to assume. At the same time, this language is consistent with particular passages which indicate towards the reigning sovereign, Charles VII., feelings of personal regard, and even of tenderness. That King, by the final success of his arms against the English, has acquired in history the surname of the Victorious'; but though affable and generous to the princes of his family, his character is not entitled to high esteem. "Because our King was of tender age and an infant," says the author, speaking as the French herald (p. 44), Henry V. of England made great conquests in France. He does not say, the King of France, but "our King;" and it is noticeable that the English herald never uses a similar expression. Again, he says, that King Charles "has met with the greatest adversities and changes of fortune which could ever befall a king . . . but after he had come to his full age, he found means by his great wisdom to reconcile the lords of his blood, and to restore amity between them" (p. 44).

We may here observe that, after the author has made Charles VII. and the princes of the blood the objects of his solicitude, he has no

commiseration left to spare for any other. He expresses no sympathy with the nobility and commonalty, with the realm of France in short, which these princes, by reason of their selfish quarrels, had brought to the verge of ruin. Amongst the nations that have been conquered and have perished, we may point to some, where a few royal or shining names by which they were signalised and adorned, and in companionship with which the spent national life once flowed, are all that is left remaining; and with these frail relics of the past we have no choice but to deck out as well as we can the inanimate form of the commonwealth which was their abode; and we retain what has thus been collected amongst the treasures of our knowledge. But an existing kingdom, in addition to a king and royal family, usually contains other orders in the State which are entitled to count for something. France, it is true, had been struck down in the English wars, but was still a living organism; and it would be affronting to the understanding to assume that the great nation, which in early times was typified by the lark,* and which in these latter days has been more ambitiously represented by the eagle, was ever in danger of

* The Gaulish legion was known in ancient Rome by the name of *Alauda*.

being reduced to the condition of a lifeless specimen of ornithology. The author of the "Debate" seems to have had no distinct apprehension of this difference; or he would hardly have been more affected by a few ruffled feathers than by the torn and drooping body of the kingdom. But again, in closing the narrative which describes the ultimate triumph of the King of France over the English, the author expresses his belief that "within the memory of man, such great and noble actions, and such great conquests, have never been achieved within so short a time as have been achieved by our King Charles, who now reigns" (p. 46); the truth being that the King, who was always pursuing his own amusements, took scarcely any active part in these conquests. So with reference to the alleged conquest of England by Charlemagne, William the Conqueror, and the King of Denmark, the author adds that Charles VII., "seeing the grace which God has given him" (p. 88), ought to be equally successful. Once more the French herald says, in a tone loftier than would have been considered becoming his station, though with appropriate reference to the indolence and love of pleasure which characterised Charles VII., "I pray to God that he will give the King of France spirit and courage to make war against

you [the English] upon the sea" (p. 60). The concluding passage put into the mouth of the French herald is still one of affectionate regard towards Charles VII : " You ought, indeed," he says, in addressing the allegorical Prudence, who is the arbiter of the debate, " to prefer and love our King who at present reigns for he has deserved well, and does not forsake the path of his noble predecessors, but follows it wisely and virtuously " (p. 89). These passages, we think, betoken in behalf of the King and royal family of France a personal interest of a special kind not likely to have been felt or expressed by a mere courtier.

But there may further be detected throughout the " Debate " an unusual distinction pervading it in favour of the princes of the blood ; and from the common propensity in our nature for everyone to exalt the rank which he regards himself as belonging to, the strong appreciation of this distinction evinced by the author seems to point him out as belonging to the highest rank of all. Thus, in describing the three estates of France, he does not simply call them the clergy, the nobility, and the commonalty, or people, but he employs the language, " The people of the clergy, the people of the nobility, and the common people " (p. 67). He uses the expressions " princes " and

"lords of the blood" as synonymous; and he treats dukes as belonging to the same order, since he names the Duke of Orleans at the head of the list of princes who bore this title, and observes that "a duke is in title next to a king, and ought to have great lords and lordships subject to him" (p. 75). He also takes exception against the English, for conferring the dignity of duke as an honorary title, and refers disdainfully to the dukes so created as being little better than heralds, who have pompous names assigned to their office, or than bishops without dioceses, who are consecrated by the Pope nominally for heathen countries. The author, too, in spite of his ostentatious respect for the office of a herald at the commencement of the "Debate," does not treat the French herald with much consideration, in making him allude thus disparagingly to the emptiness of his own professional distinctions. On the other side, the author associates princes and lords of the blood with kings, as a class apart; as when he says that the parks in France are fit "for kings and princes" (p. 12); that pheasants are delicious birds, "fit for the palate of kings and princes" (p. 13); that Arras tapestry is "ornamental in the courts of kings and princes" (p. 76); that all "kings and princes ought to aid" the French king in avenging the death of Richard II. of

England (p. 86) ; and, still more pointedly, when he declares, in a tone of pride, founded upon the recollections of Poitiers and Agincourt, that “ the kings and lords of the royal blood of France have never abandoned their people in battle ” (p. 36). Hence, it would appear that the author considered the French nation as being composed of two classes : the king and lords or princes of the blood on the one hand, and the people—including in this last term, the clergy, the rest of the nobility, and the commonalty—on the other ; and the sympathy which he permits himself to manifest, is with the former class and not with the latter. There is not throughout the “ Debate ” the slightest trace of affectation or sycophancy, and it is difficult to conceive how such a belief, coupled with such a sympathy, could honestly, and without any imputation of lunacy, have taken possession of the understanding and the heart of any human being who was not himself a prince of the blood. But if it be admitted that this reasoning supports the inference intended to be founded upon it, then no prince of the blood besides Charles of Orleans can be mentioned who fulfils the other conditions inseparable from the authorship.

IV. The evidence which has hitherto been adduced to prove that Charles of Orleans was the

author of the "Debate," if it should fail to carry conviction, will at least have raised a strong presumption in his behalf; and it now remains, by comparing particular circumstances drawn from that work with external facts, to come safely to the conclusion towards which our previous inquiry has been tending.

The "Debate" as a whole is characterised by good sense, if we assume it to have been written by a prince of the blood, since allowance must be made for the point of view from which he would be likely to regard public affairs. In the general division of the subject, what would now be termed the social, political, and economical condition of the two kingdoms is treated under the heads of Pleasure, Valour, and Riches. This narrow basis for the argument would have been natural for a prince to adopt in the fifteenth century, and when the writer of the "Debate" describes pleasure as consisting in making love, in hawking, and in hunting (p. 6), we recognise at once the three diversions* which chiefly employed the time of Charles of Orleans, during the period of his residence in England.

With respect to the first of these diversions, as the author of the "Debate" had an unlimited choice of the subjects which he might bring

* Michelet, *Hist. de France*, iv. 321, 323.

upon the scene, there was no necessity for him to introduce a comparison between female beauty in England and in France (pp. 6 and 10). On every other point the French herald is permitted to gain the victory in argument; but when he discourses on the most delicate question of all, it is left undetermined, and he seems hardly to reply with his accustomed vivacity to the exulting language indulged in by the herald of England. Happily most people will appreciate the particular type of excellence in beauty prevalent in their own country, and therefore the question becomes one which is proverbially beyond the range of allowable discussion. Still, we may ask, what French cavalier could have endured for an instant, in such a controversy, to speak languidly of the attractiveness and fascination of the daughters of France? and it would be difficult to name anyone so likely to have done this as Charles of Orleans. He was now reposing at Blois, no longer youthful, but married nearly twenty years before to his third wife, Mary of Cleves, and surrounded by a society of literary men. He had previously spent in England an exile of a quarter of a century—that middle period, the kernel of life, in which a man confirms his habits and fixes his destiny. During all this time the Prince had been continually

falling in love; and his admiration of English women is well known. A modern historian suggests that they were probably kinder to him than English men had been;* and we could wish, for the credit of human nature, that this was really the case. If then, after the heyday of passion was over, there flitted across his fancy some memorial of the past, when the rich English blood mantling in the cheek of beauty had been a response to one of the charming effusions of his muse, his countrywomen may perhaps be induced to overlook his seeming disloyalty in consideration of his susceptibility, his genius, and his misfortunes.

Another peculiarity in the author of the "Debate," and which may appear slightly ludicrous in juxtaposition with the interesting subject just noticed, is the extraordinary aversion that he manifests to sea-sickness (p. 58)—this temporary annoyance, it is to be hoped, that people in general are contented to disregard as soon as it is over. When the author, however, alleges it amongst the causes why France should not be desirous of contending with England for the dominion of the seas, the reason appears so singular, that, in spite of the sad example of Rome's greatest orator, the reader may scarcely

* Michelet, iv. 323, note.

be prepared to meet with the same intense and exaggerated feeling of dislike reproduced elsewhere ; but we will supply him with a repetition of it. About a month after the battle of Agincourt, Henry V., having set sail from Calais, crossed the Channel, and arrived in the evening of the same day at Dovor. A writer of repute gives this account of the voyage :—" Though the wind was favourable, the passage was extremely boisterous, and the effect of it upon the French noblemen, the most important of whom were in the King's own ship, is described to have been so severe, that they considered their sufferings on the day of the battle not to have exceeded what they then experienced."* In fact, the most important of all the French noblemen in the King's own ship was Charles, Duke of Orleans. Whether that voyage from Calais to Dovor had any connection with the aversion exhibited by the author of the " Debate " is not easily determined after a lapse of between four and five centuries, but the coincidence is worthy of being remarked.

The impression on the mind of the author of the " Debate " must have been that England is a level country, since the English herald twice alleges it to be so (pp. 7 and 62), and the French

* *Battle of Agincourt*, by Sir Harris Nicolas, 2nd edition, p. 147.

herald repeats the assertion, and reasons upon it as an admitted fact (p. 87). We know, on the contrary, that although the eastern half of England may be mostly flat, yet the western half is not; and that, upon the whole, when compared with France in the fifteenth century, England can by no means be called a level country. It becomes necessary, therefore, supposing Charles of Orleans to have been the author, to inquire where he resided during the twenty-five years of his exile, since it is certain that he was not allowed to rove at large, and if he was likely to have formed this erroneous opinion. Five places of his residence are mentioned:—

1. Windsor Castle.
2. Pontefract Castle, in the North Riding of Yorkshire.
3. Bolingbroke Castle, in Lincolnshire.
4. Ampthill Castle, in Bedfordshire.
5. Wingfield Castle, in Suffolk.

He was also several times detained in London, and it is possible to trace him during twenty-one years either there, or at one of these five castles, following the order which has been indicated. How long he remained at each is not so readily ascertained; but where the ruins of the regicidal old castle still look down frowningly over the liquorice-gardens of Pontefract is the spot most

commonly associated with his captivity. Now all these castles lie on the eastern side of England, and there is not in the neighbourhood of any one of them so high a hill as Charles of Orleans would have seen from London, while in his various journeys to and from the metropolis, he would have had to pass through the flattest districts of the kingdom.

In the "Debate" (p. 16) the battle of Verneuil is associated with the three other great victories which have furnished to Englishmen names that have sounded like household words to them from childhood, but what ought chiefly to attract attention is that the author by whom it has been so distinguished, although under the character of the English herald, is a Frenchman. There appears to be wanting some reason for his attaching so much consequence to a battle in which the French numbered only 7,000 men, and the victory gained was followed by no important result. Yet the House of Commons uttered no more than the opinion of their constituents when, in a formal document, they described the battle, nine years after it had been fought, as "the greatest deed done by Englishmen in our days, save the battle of Agincourt."* The significance of the deed performed at Verneuil

* *Rolls of Parliament*, iv. 423.

is easily explained. When Henry V. invaded France, the oppressed kingdom called in the assistance of the Scots, who defeated the English at Baugé, and this defeat was memorable, because it first proved to the world that upon the French soil the invaders were not invincible. When, therefore, the English encountered again the French and Scots combined in about equal proportions at Verneuil, the decisive victory gained over both enemies at once was doubly grateful. An English contemporary chronicler, in concluding his account of the battle, thus gives expression to the general sentiment : " But the most vengeance fell upon the proud Scots, for there went to sheep-wash of them the same day more than 1,700 of coat-arms, by a counting of heralds."* If a Londoner could write thus, it may be imagined what must have been the feeling towards the countrymen of Wallace and Bruce in the northern counties, which the Scots never lost an opportunity of devastating. Charles of Orleans was residing either at Pontefract or Bolingbroke, when the battle was fought, and would have been in constant communication with travellers from the north, on their journey southward. His impression of the battle must therefore have been influenced by the people

* *Chronicle of London*, edited by Sir H. Nicolas, p. 112.

around him, who, in their enmity towards the Scots, would regard the triumph at Verneuil with hardly less complacency than the more celebrated one at Agincourt.

We might proceed in this manner, and take passage after passage from the "Debate," and show how, while each helps to mark the author's individuality, it is at the same time consistent with his representing Charles of Orleans. Thus the rivalry between the houses of Orleans and Burgundy will account for the author insisting that France was a "free" kingdom (p. 31), which Burgundy was not, but a mass of dependent States, held under the King of France or the Emperor. This distinction would be of importance to a French prince, and Charles of Orleans was particularly sensible of it;* while it would only be of slight concern to other subjects of the realm. A similar reason will account for the author asserting that England was not, like France, one of the Four Nations in the councils of Christendom (p. 70), because this question gave rise to an animated debate at the Council of Constance, between forty and fifty years before, at which time Charles of Orleans must have watched the proceedings of the Council with

* See the last line of each of the stanzas of *The Complaint of France* (p. 132), and the second line of the ballad (p. 164).

extreme interest, since he and the Duke of Burgundy were more concerned in them than any other laymen in Europe.* We may also observe, that when the author speaks of the King of Spain as the “*brother and ally*” of the King of France (p. 59), such language, though usual in the intercourse between royal personages themselves, is hardly such as a private individual would be likely to apply to the ordinary political relationship between sovereigns. It would likewise have been thought by a man of common rank, contrary to the idea suggested in the “*Debate*” (p. 33), that when God sends a famine, it is rather the people than the king who are likely to suffer from it. Again, who but a French prince would have applauded the abominable treason and murder committed by Queen Isabella, the “*she-wolf of France*,”† to which her consort, Edward II. of England, fell a victim (p. 39)? Or who was likely to have reiterated so often the expression *great magnificence* as a prince who delighted in and required the stateliness which it indicates? Once more: the pride of birth, added to a feeling of personal dislike, may have

* On the question of Jean Petit's doctrine of assassination, with relation to the death of Louis, Duke of Orleans, the father of Charles of Orleans.

† See Gray's *Bard*, and note to p. 39.

suggested to the Duke of Orleans, that he was entitled to speak of the famous Earl of Shrewsbury as "this Talbot" (p. 46); but we are persuaded that courtesy would have forbidden any Frenchman, not of royal blood, thus to designate the accomplished and resolute commander, who, amidst the declining fortune of his countrymen, so lived and died as to enable them to quit France without incurring dishonour. The examples which have been given, however, will serve to show that what might be deemed peculiarities in the author of the "Debate" correspond with circumstances in the life of Charles of Orleans.*

V. There is, however, connected with the contest between the two kingdoms in the fifteenth century, an omission so flagrant in the "Debate," that to avoid noticing it would be inexcusable, since it excludes some of the most important events in the history of France, and will, moreover, serve to disclose a distinguishing fea-

* The mistake in using the word *maniple* instead of *apparel*, as already pointed out (p. 29), seems to show that the author was a layman, and not in orders. It may also here be noticed that on the trial of the Duke of Alençon, for high treason, Charles of Orleans delivered a speech of considerable length, which has been published by M. Champollion-Figeac (*Louis et Charles, ducs d'Orléans*, p. 368), and in which will be found the same kind of sentiments, language, and personification of moral qualities which appear in the *Debate*.

ture in the character of the author whom we are endeavouring to discover.

At the funeral of a noble Roman matron, the spectators once observed, amongst the images of illustrious ancestors and relatives of the deceased which were borne in procession, that the effigies of her husband and brother, the two great leaders of the constitutional party, were absent. A jealous prince had thought it not expedient that the recollection of the citizens of Rome should be refreshed by these memorials of past glory, which reflected no credit upon himself; but the historian who relates the occurrence has appended to it the remark, that Cassius and Brutus were rendered eminently conspicuous by the very fact that their effigies were not seen. It may be that the omission which we are now to observe has already led, and will lead again, to a result similarly disappointing.

The author of the "Debate" has recounted succinctly, but fairly, the victories and conquests of the English during the Hundred Years' War; and when he comes to describe how the French succeeded at last in repelling the invaders, he enters more into detail, and specifies a number of petty fortresses in Guienne (p. 45). The first event which he mentions is the capture of Paris (p. 45), and anyone unacquainted with the real facts

would infer from his description, that this achievement was the earliest performed by the French, after the tide of victory had turned in their favour. Such an inference, however, is erroneous. Between the highest point of success attained by the English and their loss of Paris, an interval of several years elapsed, which in the "Debate" is passed over in silence, and during which the French had virtually re-conquered the kingdom. It was within this omitted period that the siege of Orleans was raised—the most splendid exploit of the French in the war, and the turning-point of their political life for all the future, since it decided the question, whether a home-born or an alien race was to have the mastery of France. Within the same period was fought the battle of Patay, in which the English army was defeated in the open field, and their general, the celebrated Talbot, was taken prisoner. There occurred also the famous march of Charles VII across the kingdom, and besides other events, the striking and significant fact of his coronation at Rheims, in spite of all the efforts of his enemies. There had furthermore appeared upon the scene and vanished from sight one of the most interesting characters in history, to whom has been attributed the honour of these successes which saved France from per-

dition. It would have made the story of the French herald worth telling to have related these things; and why has he left them out? In our inability to account for this disingenuousness in the narrative, we are led to inquire what interest or reputation could be promoted by such a palpable suppression of material facts; and the only answer which presents itself is, that the persons whom the omission was intended to serve could have been no other than Charles VII. and Charles, Duke of Orleans. Putting, therefore, the King for the present out of the question, we are left to examine whether the matters excluded connect the Prince with the authorship of the "Debate."

The siege of Orleans could hardly have been absent from the memory of the Duke of Orleans, since that city was the capital of his own province; yet, if he wrote the "Debate," how came he to overlook Joan of Arc, the Maid of Orleans? That heroine had not formerly been unmindful of him; but, on the contrary, when carrying victory before her, at the head of the warriors of France, she had especially remembered the unfortunate exile in his low estate.

Notwithstanding all the researches which have been made into the earlier life of Joan of Arc, little more is known than that she was a gentle,

modest, and pious maiden, liable to be acted upon through the impressions of a vivid imagination. It was not until after the territories of Charles of Orleans had been invaded, and his capital city was in danger, that she first attracted the public gaze by quitting her village home, and making her appearance in the camp amongst armed men. Upon her arrival there, she announced that her business was to support the cause of Charles of Orleans.* The nature of the deception practised upon her when she was introduced into the presence of the King, and the misconceptions which have arisen out of that interview, we shall not stay now to discuss.† We have simply to narrate ascertained and indisputable facts. Her earliest exploit, which surprised alike both friends and foes, was in conducting, amidst apparently insuperable difficulties, a convoy of provisions into the besieged city of Orleans; and in her first conversation with the

* Quicherat, *Procès, &c. de Jeanne d'Arc*, iv. 10.

† Several questions relating to Joan of Arc will have to be re-argued by any biographer who undertakes to write a trustworthy history of her life, founded upon the original documents brought together by M. Quicherat. After giving much attention to the subject, we have come to the conclusion that the deception referred to in the text lies at the bottom of the secret which Joan of Arc refused to reveal upon her trial, and which was so disingenuously dealt with on the subsequent trial of rehabilitation. We would also suggest for consideration whether her momentary recantation, which has been so much boasted of by her enemies, was made by her during a state of consciousness.

brave Dunois, who was then in command of the garrison, she emphatically declared it to be the will of heaven that the English should not obtain possession of the city as well as of the person of Charles of Orleans.* She forthwith proceeded to direct the operations which resulted in the accomplishment of her prediction; the English army decamped, and the siege of Orleans was raised. Her next endeavours were employed in capturing the strongholds held by the English in the neighbourhood. “She always had her eye and her thoughts directed towards the affairs of the Duke of Orleans,”† says the only chronicler who was a witness of the events; and again he says: “She took great delight in recovering his fortresses.”‡ But the interest which Joan of Arc manifested in the Prince’s welfare did not confine itself to fighting for the recovery of his patrimony, since she declared from the outset, that her mission was to deliver not only the city of Orleans, but likewise to set free from captivity Charles, Duke of Orleans.§ There were but few in authority besides herself, however, who cared much for the exiled Prince, while there were many who were anxious to divert her efforts into channels more profitable to their own interests;

* Dunois’ deposition, *Procès*, iii. 7.

† *Ibid.* iv. 10.

† *Ibid.* iv. 11.

§ *Ibid.* iii. 99.

and the delivery of Charles of Orleans from his imprisonment in England might fairly have appeared to ordinary minds an impossibility. Her declaration of what she had originally intended in his favour, was but too well remembered against her at a later period. Being interrogated, during the long agony of her trial, how she meant to have accomplished her design, she replied with spirit, that she would have taken English prisoners sufficient to exchange for the Prince; and that, if this resource had failed, she would have gone over to England with an armed force to fetch him.* We may perhaps be permitted to surmise, that it was compassion for Charles of Orleans which first aroused in Joan of Arc the dormant energy destined to produce such important results in favour of her country, and that her grander idea of expelling the foreigner from France was a subsequent emanation of her genius; since it is in the nature of woman to attach herself to the cause of an individual, and there is not wanting evidence pregnant in behalf of this supposition. At all events, before she fell into the power of the English, and was left, unransomed and unheeded, to perish by a death of infamy, she had recovered for Charles of Orleans his principality; and we may reason-

* *Procès*, i. 133.

ably suppose that he could distinguish whether its revenues were enjoyed by himself or by the enemy. She had also inspired her countrymen with confidence in themselves, and had thus given to them an impetus, carrying them on to further successes,* which produced the effect of abridging his captivity. And when imprisoned and fettered, with the torture and death awaiting her, and when her diligence and devotedness in his behalf could do no more, she did not abandon his cause, or moan over his dereliction of her own, but affirmed steadfastly in the face of her persecutors, "she knew well that God loved Charles of Orleans;"† he had been her first care, and he was her last, and she gave for him all that she had left. That all was the life of a peasant girl—an oblation which was not valued highly in those days; yet was it an oblation which the judgment of posterity has deemed of great price. Although numbering only nineteen years at its close,‡ it was a life, weighed against which the prolonged existence of Charles of Orleans, had it not been for his poetic fame, would now be regarded as dust in the balance; for the worth of every remembered human life, while that life

* *Procès*, iii. 8. The evidence of Dunois on this point is remarkable and decisive.

† *Ib.* i. 258.

‡ *Ib.* i. 46.

lasts, and when it is ended, is subject to a different estimate, and the ordinary distinctions of rank and wealth, which are everything with the present, are nothing with the hereafter. The present says to each one of us, Who art thou? but the future, if it care to inquire, will ask the graver question, What hast thou done with thy life? For genius, courage, unselfishness, kindness, purity, and truth, combined with fervent love of her country, and heroic exertion and success in accomplishing its deliverance, the name of Joan of Arc stands unsurpassed amongst women. Charles of Orleans has not had the good fortune to distinguish himself as a statesman or a soldier, and his disinterestedness, if he ever had any, is unrecorded, while his patriotism has been justly called in question.* He has left behind him, however, a volume of most agreeable poems, consisting of between four and five hundred pages, throughout which there is not a word that alludes to the existence of Joan of Arc. This neglect has been unfavourably commented upon, although it may have been unavoidable;

* See, in the *Fœdera*, vol. x., p. 556, the treaty by which he bound himself upon the happening of certain events to become the man of the King of England, and to fight against France. Rymer notices with respect to this treaty, the unusual circumstance that the seal had been torn away—possibly by the act of some loyal and indignant Frenchman.

since, while chivalry was a living faith, it would have been thought incongruous in a royal Prince, who was expending his enthusiasm in making love to every handsome woman he met with, to be chanting the praises of a maiden who had been fighting his battles and rescuing his dominions. But after he was restored to liberty; when he had grown old, and the fair enchantresses of England were far away, and his days of love must have been wellnigh over; when he had leisure to review his past life, and the evils which she, the saviour of her country, had helped him to escape, how came it, if we assume him to have been the author of the "Debate," that with so excellent an opportunity for acknowledging his obligations, he forgot to mention the Maid of Orleans? Perhaps he thought there was no great merit in saving a country which, in the pursuit of his own interest, he had not scrupled to resign to its fate. Or we may have recourse to another supposition. He was not deficient in credulity, and both of the rival kingdoms agreed that Joan of Arc was inspired; although they differed respecting the good or evil quality of her inspiration.* Perhaps the English

* Besides the general discrepancy of belief, which is notorious, we have particular testimony of the opposite belief of the most distinguished soldier in each kingdom. Dunois declared on oath his con-

air had infected the faith as well as the loyalty of Charles of Orleans, so that he doubted whether, through her agency, it was God or the devil that had been fighting for France. He admits, in his political ballad, written about the year 1453, that God by this time had declared himself wholly on the French side.* Did God, then,

viction that Joan was miraculously inspired by God (*Procès*, iii. 3). John, Duke of Bedford, in a grave official document, described her as a "limb of the fiend, called the Pucelle, who used false enchantments and sorcery" (*Rolls of Parliament*, v. p. 435). Turning from these distinguished warriors to two other men of distinction in another capacity, we may observe that Shakespeare, relying upon the chroniclers, has embodied the old English feeling respecting Joan of Arc, and represented her character in the most odious light. It was the error of the country and age in which he lived; but the ribaldry of Voltaire is less easily excused. On the other hand, Hume, who was not apt to be carried away by enthusiasm, has given the reins to his admiration for Joan of Arc, and speaks of her as "This admirable heroine, to whom the more generous superstition of the ancients would have erected altars." Amongst the various biographers of Joan of Arc who have accounted for her exploits from the miraculous point of view, we do not recollect that any one of them has dwelt much upon the curious fact, which is deposited to upon the oath of more than one contemporary witness, that the heroine was remarkably skilful in the employment of artillery.

* See p. 134 *supra*. Sharon Turner has given this ballad in a note to his *History of England* (vol. vi., p. 28). The first stanza of it, which we here insert, is superior to the remainder :—

Comment voy-je ces Anglois esbahis,
 Resjoys toys, franc royaume de France,
 On aperçoit que de Dieu sont haïs,
 Puis qu'ilz n'ont plus courage ni puissance.
 Bien pensoient par leur outrecuidance,
 Toy surmonter et tenir en servaige,
 Et ont tenu à tort ton héritaige.

notwithstanding his hatred of the English, only half declare himself against them before the Maid had suffered? The poor people at Blois may have thought so, for superstition is multiform, and such a belief was not unnatural in the stubborn folly of its old vicious instinct, and would have been in harmony with the semi-paganism into which the middle ages had fallen. It is of necessity that the sacrificial offering should be worthy and without stain, and the Maid of Orleans was immolated as an expiatory victim for the offences of the princes of the blood. Such, there is reason to think, was the belief of tens of thousands of Frenchmen, though it

Mais à présent, Dieu pour toy se combat,
Et se monstre du tout de ta partie ;
Leur grant orgueil entièrement abat,
Et t'a rendu Guienne et Normandie.

Champollion-Figeac's ed., p. 194.

The following translation may perhaps be useful to some of our readers :—

In what amazement do I behold these English !
Rejoice, free kingdom of France !
It seems that they are hated of God,
For they no longer possess courage or strength ;
They really thought, with their presumption,
To overcome thee, and keep thee in bondage ;
And wrongfully they held thine inheritance.
But now God fights for thee,
And declares himself wholly on thy side ;
Their great pride he completely abases,
And hath restored to thee Guienne and Normandy.

is not likely that Charles of Orleans would be amongst the number. No, he did not forget Joan of Arc; but there remains the fact of the omission to be accounted for consistently with the theory which we are supporting, and a reason for it is only too obvious. That blind, obdurate pride of blood which, like the robe of Nessus, clung to the ancient French nobility, marring the fine qualities of an otherwise eminently brave, polished, intelligent, and generous race, would forbid him to recognise the truth, that in a matter pertaining to honour he could be indebted to anyone of servile birth. For him, a prince of no great magnanimity, to confess that he owed all this debt to a peasant maiden, and to record judgment of it against himself, would be conditions not to be endured. No wonder that, under such a pressure, his generosity, with its slender resources, should have become bankrupt.

As a proof of authorship, however, the omission which has been noticed is important, since long before the "Debate" was written, the facts which have been excluded were fully admitted.*

* The interest excited throughout Christendom, at an early date, by the career of Joan of Arc, is proved by a slight incident which La Broequiré has mentioned as having happened to himself while he was at Constantinople in 1432. He says:—"I was lodged with a Catalonian merchant, who, having told one of the officers of the palace that I was

It had also been thought becoming to ennoble the family of a heroine who was the means of saving France ; and a nobleman not allied to the royal family might have felt without indignity that the Maid herself was inscribed in his order. A venal writer, who had suppressed the facts in order to procure the favour of the King, or of Charles of Orleans, must necessarily have shown some similar meanness of spirit in another part of his work, and it may be confidently asserted that no instance of this kind can be discovered in the “Debate.” * Upon the assumption that Charles of Orleans was the author can we alone account for the omission which we have been considering, since he alone could have believed himself

attached to my Lord of Burgundy, the Emperor caused me to be asked if it were true that the Duke had taken the Pucelle d’Orleans, which the Greeks would scarcely believe. I told them truly how the matter had passed, at which they were greatly astonished.” See his *Travels*, translated by Colonel Johnes, p. 231.

* Antonio Astezan, secretary to Charles of Orleans, translated the Prince’s poems into Latin verse, and was a man of ability, possessing the confidence and acquainted with the affairs of his master. Of the numerous objections against his being the author of the *Debate*, however, one will suffice. He duly appreciated Joan of Arc, and composed many indifferent verses in her honour, amongst which, an epitaph upon Charles VII. will afford a specimen (*Procès*, v. 23). It is morally impossible that the author of that epitaph could have written the *Debate*. This last remark applies equally to the Duke of Alençon, who married the eldest daughter of Charles of Orleans, and who had been himself a prisoner in England. But he was also the chief friend of Joan of Arc during her life, and the chief witness to testify to her merits after her death.

interested in the suppression, and was at the same time competent to have produced it.

VI. We now propose, by way of conclusion, to select one more passage from the "Debate," and to fix the authorship of it upon Charles of Orleans positively, to the exclusion of every other competitor. The case which has been already made out in his behalf is, we think, sufficiently strong to stand alone, without the aid of any such support; but we have purposely reserved this confirmatory evidence to the last, in the hope that our readers may be able to part upon terms of amity with the Prince. The inexorable necessity of our argument has compelled us to exhibit prominently the weakness of his character, and we owe him this reparation. After all, no one seeks in the flowering shrub of the garden for the durability and toughness of fibre which belong to the tree of the forest. There was no malignity in the nature of Charles of Orleans, and a Prince who excited so much interest in England,* who was so greatly beloved

* The story is apocryphal, that the English ladies, in honour of Charles of Orleans and his mother Valentine of Milan, instituted St. Valentine's day, as the festival of love; since the day was so commemorated in the time of Chaucer, and Lydgate speaks of it as if the custom of choosing lovers on that day had been one of long standing.

by his own subjects,* and whom so elevated and so pure a being as Joan of Arc vouched for that God loved him also,† must have possessed qualities of rare fascination. We shall meet with him now upon the broad ground of humanity, where “one touch of nature makes the whole world kin.”

In order to justify a threatened invasion of England, the author of the “Debate,” in the character of the French herald; brings this accusation against the English :—“You killed and murdered

* It is known with what earnest entreaties the citizens of Orleans, before the siege began, had besought the Duke of Burgundy to take their city under his protection until it could be restored to their natural lord, Charles of Orleans, who was then detained in England. The gallantry and devotion to their Prince which these same citizens manifested in their resistance throughout the siege forms a striking fact in history. But another instance of the affection borne towards him has recently come to light. At the battle of Baugé, the Duke of Clarence, brother of Henry V., of England, was unhorsed by a blow from a lance, said to have been given by the Scotch knight, Sir Alan Swinton. Being thus dismounted, and lying upon the ground in the churchyard of Baugé, where the battle was raging most furiously, Charles Piscerne, a subject of Charles of Orleans, flung himself upon the body of the English prince, with the design of saving his life, in order to exchange him for his own lord, then a prisoner to the English. A fierce Scot, however, in his eagerness to shed the blood of an Englishman, killed with one thrust of his weapon both the Duke of Clarence and his intended preserver (*Narrative of the Expulsion of the English from Guienne and Normandy*, p. 178).

† This declaration was made, indeed, before Charles of Orleans had entered into the treaty with England referred to in the note, *supra*, p. 162. Could Joan of Arc herself, if she had lived to be old, have preserved the ideal of excellence which she has left behind? Surely there was wisdom in the ancient Greek saying, “He whom the gods love dies young.”

King Richard, who was married to the daughter of France, and that bad business has never yet been avenged.”*

The death of Richard II. took place in the year 1400, or more than half a century before the work containing this sentence could have been written; and a natural reflection upon the passage would be, that if the English chose to kill and murder their king, surely it was their own affair, and no foreigner, after such a long interval of time, could have any just cause for feeling aggrieved by what they had done. Richard's marriage with Isabella of France was never consummated, and the youthful Queen had been honourably restored to her country after the death of her royal consort. The gravity of the events which had since ensued between the two kingdoms would, it might be presumed, have been sufficient to extinguish in the mind of a Frenchman all concern for a transaction possessing chiefly a local interest: added to which, when Henry V. married Katherine of France, the younger sister of Isabella, the condonation of the House of Lancaster by the countrymen of his Queen must be held to have been complete. To parade then in the foreground, with so much passion, a sentimental grievance like this as a

* *Supra*, p. 86.

reason for the hostile invasion of England appears upon a first glance to be incomprehensible. We have only to take the nearest analogous instance from modern times, and judge what would be said of an Austrian, who, since the establishment of the Second Empire, had brought forward a charge in similar terms against the French, on account of the death of Louis XVI. But the passage just quoted is not the only one of its kind in the "Debate," since Richard II. is mentioned again, and there is superadded the significant remark, which had no relevancy to the matter then under discussion, "and afterwards he was wickedly murdered" (p. 88). That the author should first have declared, in a manner seemingly so unaccountable, his abhorrence of the murder of King Richard, and should afterwards have travelled out of his path to stigmatise the crime again, are, therefore, circumstances which demand further investigation.

If we now turn to the political ballad which was composed by Charles of Orleans, upon the expulsion of the English from Guienne and Normandy, and which has been before referred to, but has not yet been put into the crucible, there will be found in it two lines conveying in more measured terms the same feeling of indignation :—

“Have not Englishmen often committed treason against their kings?

Yes, truly ; all the world knows it.”*

This ballad could not, any more than the “Debate,” have been written prior to the year 1453. King Richard’s death is the sole treason which the poet really intended, because the only other notorious to all the world consisted in the deposition and murder of Edward II., more than 120 years previously, in which transaction his Queen, another Isabella of France, was the most prominent agent ; and Charles of Orleans, as a member of the same royal family which was so deeply implicated in that tragedy, was hardly likely to have regarded it as a treason at all.† Besides, in celebrating the recent conquests gained by France, the treason against King Richard formed the only one appropriately connected with the subject. There is also a more convincing reason behind why the meaning should be thus restricted, and which will appear as we proceed.

We have thus three distinct passages, in every one of which the death of King Richard is treated of in language evincing greater or less emotion ; and not one of them was written by an Englishman ; or within half a century after

* N’ont pas Anglois souvent leurs roys trahis ?
Certes ouyl, tous en ont congnoissance.

† See p. 39.

the event, in spite of the antecedent improbability that any foreigner should have treasured up such a feeling. Indeed, if we put Charles of Orleans out of the question, we maintain it to be impossible to show that there was any Frenchman of rank to whom the fate of Richard II. was a subject of personal and deeply interesting concern so long after his decease. Upon this assumption, then, since Charles of Orleans undoubtedly composed one of the passages quoted, about the time when the others were written, an inference arises that he wrote these others also, and that we may expect to find evidence of the fact. But if such an expectation is to be realised, then this evidence will prove that there must have been in force some paramount reason why the violent death of Richard should have left upon his memory the painful and lasting impression which the two passages taken from the "Debate" disclose. Let us now try the first and strongest of them by this test, and confine our further attention to that alone, since by its importance it entirely absorbs the second, and we wish not to encumber the question unnecessarily. In order that the reader may have the matter clearly before him, we here repeat the passage which we undertake to bring home to the Prince :—" You killed and murdered King Richard, who was married to the

daughter of France, and that bad business has never yet been avenged."

In the middle ages the widow and relations of a man who had been murdered possessed the right, which was converted by society into an imperative duty, to avenge his death. This right was common throughout Europe, though variously regulated by municipal law;* and in England it was of such potency as to override the royal prerogative of mercy, since the king could not pardon the criminal who was condemned under it. Life for life was the penalty due to the kindred, just like a sum of money recoverable by executors upon a bond given to their testator. The mode of procedure in this country was by an Appeal of Murder, and when the accused was found guilty, the ancient usage, which still existed in Henry IV.'s time, was for the relatives of the murdered man to drag the culprit to the place of execution.† But Henry IV. himself was generally suspected of having caused the death of King Richard; and as the force of the kingdom was on his side, no one in England was strong enough to bring him to an account. The

* The right was modified in England by Magna Charta (c. 34), and various ancient statutes, and was not actually abolished until the present century. See also Monstrelet, p. 197.

† Blackstone, *Com.* iv. 316.

right of vengeance, therefore, in conformity with the opinion of the age, devolved upon Richard's widow, and other relatives beyond the realm. Inasmuch, however, as France was at that time distracted by internal troubles, Charles VI., the father of Isabella, after making a few vain efforts, found himself incapable of interfering effectually on her behalf. In this emergency her uncle, Louis, Duke of Orleans, first prince of the blood of full age, proclaimed himself her champion, and challenged Henry IV.* It happens that we possess an account of this last incident in language which may be regarded as the testimony of our Charles of Orleans himself, and which is, in fact, part of an address on behalf of the Orleans family, delivered before the assembled court of France, in the most solemn moment of his life. It was spoken on the memorable occasion when he accompanied his mother, Valentine of Milan, and her younger children, into the presence of the King, sitting in the seat of judgment, in order to denounce John the Fearless, Duke of Burgundy, and to demand vengeance against him for the assassination of

* The Count of St. Pol, who had married a half-sister of Richard II., also sent a challenge to Henry IV., which the latter declined to accept; whereupon the Count had recourse to an ingenious contrivance for insulting his adversary, which is related at length by Monstrelet, l. i. c. 10.

this same Louis, Duke of Orleans, the husband of that lady, and Charles's own father. The passage is as follows:—

“The Duke [Louis] of Orleans both felt and showed much grief on account of the death of King Richard, and thereupon became the enemy of King Henry of Lancaster, and sent him a challenge, charging him with the crime of high treason against his lord King Richard, and offering to avenge the death of that King by fighting King Henry, either in single combat, or with any stipulated number of men on each side.”*

Valentine of Milan, failing to obtain the vengeance which she sought, pined away and died; but as John the Fearless was afterwards, in his turn, assassinated, the sanguinary account between the Houses of Orleans and Burgundy was at this point balanced. Far different had it hitherto been with the rivalry between the Houses of York and Lancaster, which sprang out of the catastrophe that befel King Richard. There no retribution followed; “all the soil of the achievement” had gone with the first spoiler into the earth; the crown of England had been worn by him throughout his life, had descended to his son, and now pressed heavily upon the brow of his grandson—one and all of whom were the declared enemies of the House of Orleans. On the other hand, Charles of Orleans was the representative of that house; he had inherited

* Monstrelet, p. 120.

its enmities, and he was the son of that Louis of Orleans who had denounced the treason and proclaimed himself the mortal enemy of Henry of Lancaster, the usurper of King Richard's throne. Nor was this all. Charles of Orleans had begun his own public career by marrying Isabella of France, the relict of Richard, and had thereby committed himself more deeply in the eyes of the world to the maintenance of his hereditary quarrel with the House of Lancaster, and to avenge the insult inflicted upon his Princess by the death of the murdered King.* It was a marriage, indeed, which had been enforced not without many tears shed by the daughter of France, who had recently worn a crown; for Charles was then but a stripling,† while the consort whom Isabella had lost, besides being a king, was handsome, and in the flower of his age, and possessed, moreover, those exterior graces and accomplishments which are not without influence in attracting woman's love. The Princess did not long survive her second nuptials, but closed her life in giving birth to an only

* He married Isabella of France in June, 1406, and on the 2nd of October following there appears to have been issued a proclamation, in the name of Charles VI., but in reality by the Duke of Orleans, calling upon the English to rise in rebellion against Henry IV., and avenge the death of King Richard (*Traïson et mort de Richard II.*, p. 299).

† Juvenal des Ursins, *Hist. de Charles VI.*, p. 179.

daughter, who had been subsequently united in marriage to the Duke of Alençon.*

From this retrospect it is apparent that, even at the distance of more than fifty years, Charles of Orleans did have reason for feeling an interest

* There is not much information to be gathered respecting this daughter of Charles of Orleans and the former "little Queen" of England, as she was popularly called; but M. Quicherat's volumes afford us one pleasing glimpse of her in connexion with Joan of Arc. When Joan made her first appearance before Orleans, the Duke and Duchess of Alençon, who were residing in the neighbourhood, invited her to pay them a visit, and she appears to have spent several days in their society, and to have been treated by them with kindness and respect. She afterwards attached herself chiefly to the person of that Prince, and fought by his side. The Duke had formerly been taken prisoner by the English at the battle of Verneuil, and only recovered his liberty by payment of an enormous ransom. This disaster had probably crippled the family resources; and, with a true woman's feeling, the daughter of Charles of Orleans feared the danger which her husband might again incur through the heroine's daring courage. What follows is so graphically described in the Duke of Alençon's own deposition upon oath, that we give the passage entire: "It was determined that the town [of Jargeau] should be assaulted; the criers shouted, 'To the assault!' and Joan herself said to this deponent, 'Forward, gentle Duke, to the assault!' And when it seemed to this deponent that they were proceeding too hastily in commencing the attack so soon, the said Joan exclaimed to this deponent, 'Do not hesitate, for now is the time when it pleases God;' and that we must work when such is the will of God: 'Work and God will work!' and she said further to this deponent, 'What, gentle Duke, are you afraid? do you not know that I have promised your wife to bring you back safe and sound?' And, in fact, when this deponent parted from his wife in order to accompany the said Joan to the army, the deponent's wife informed the said Joan that she had great apprehensions on account of this deponent, and that, because he had recently been a prisoner, and paid so large a sum for his ransom, she had earnestly entreated this deponent to remain at home. Then the said Joan replied, 'Do not be afraid, my lady, I will bring him back safe to you, and as well, or better, than he is now'" (*Procès*, iii. 96).

in the violence done to King Richard ; and we are not concerned with other portions of his life which might disqualify him from now calling for redress. He was a poet, and it may well be that, overcome by the inspiration of the moment, he gave expression to an unappeased desire of vengeance, without considering how much he might compromise himself by the avowal. It is sufficient that we have singled out the one man living at the time when the " Debate " was written, from whose lips the fervent words which have been quoted were intelligible and natural ; for the death of Richard touched him in the most sensitive point of his nature, his pride as a prince of the blood ; it had been with him ever since his youth an affair of home and of the family ; it affected his personal honour, and was intertwined with the most deeply-rooted of his affections ; and, as though all this were not enough, it had been kept rankling in his bosom by the additional severity of fortune, which had confined him throughout long years of captivity in the same castle and prison of Pontefract where the unhappy Richard had miserably perished. We will even venture to advance a step further in our appeal to the common nature which binds together all the children of men. In the Prince's early days, after the death of King Richard, and

before the storm of adversity which was impending had begun to fall upon the House of Orleans, is it incredible that the father, the young son, and his bride, when conversing together at the domestic hearth, may have sometimes alluded to the tragical event which had affrighted the two kingdoms, in the homely phrase, "that bad business?"* We know not; yet reason itself will declare that that passionate outburst of resentment denouncing the murder of King Richard is not the language of one who speaks as the echo of another; the sense of private injury breaks through the conventional restraint which the author imposes upon himself while he has to describe only the general woes of the kingdom, but the feelings of the man overpower him when he comes to divulge the bitterness of the heart with which a stranger does not intermeddle. That utterance betrays the voice of Charles, Duke of Orleans.

•

VII. It has now been shown that Charles of Orleans was qualified in all respects to be the author whom we have been in search of; that one at least of his poems corresponds so closely with the "Debate," as to raise the strongest pre-

* In the original, *ce mauvais cas*. See the Additional Note, *supra*, p. 119.

•

sumption that the writer of the latter work must have been acquainted with, and have copied from, the former ; and that this writer was not likely to have been one of the Prince's literary companions, but that he was in all probability a member of the royal family of France, and consequently the Prince himself. A variety of peculiarities characteristic of the writer of the "Debate" are then shown to be consistent with circumstances in the life of Charles of Orleans ; and, lastly, the authorship of a particular passage in the "Debate" is, we believe, brought home positively to the Prince. Without placing any reliance, therefore, upon the resemblance in style, sentiments, and language, between the "Debate" and the other poems, which we have not thought it necessary to pursue in detail, it is submitted that the conclusion which we have been supporting is established ; or, in other words, that Charles, Duke of Orleans, wrote the "Debate between the Heralds of France and England."



CONCLUSION.



Conclusion.

IN the "Debate between the Heralds of France and England," the author has compared together the two kingdoms with reference to pleasure, valour and riches. On the first and last of these subjects, it will perhaps be thought that in the preceding explanatory notes his views have been already sufficiently considered. In his treatment of the subject of valour, however, the author has given an historical summary reaching down to the middle of the fifteenth century, and ending, in 1453, with the expulsion of the English from France, which event he himself survived only a few years. Now that four centuries have elapsed, we are able to cast a glance abroad, and to recognise with more clearness the influences which were then in operation. It is an interesting point of time in the annals of Europe,

and especially of England, lying midway between the Norman conquest and our own days. Standing at that point, there is a wide prospect on the right hand and on the left. How much has been done and suffered by us old nations of the Old World within that period of eight hundred years; and how much of evil has been overcome! The rivalry between England and France is one of the grandest facts in history; and now each nation has come more illustrious out of the conflict. The night will be dark whenever either of those stars, each in its appointed sphere, shall cease to be resplendent in the firmament of civilisation.

The two principles which upheld society during the middle ages—faith in God and faith in man—were still represented at the commencement of the fifteenth century by the Church and Feudalism. Both of these institutions in times past had done good service, and between them they had saved Europe from the sensualism and despotism of Asia. But in the middle of that century an unforeseen crisis alarmed the Christian world. While the descendants of the Crusaders were weakening themselves by intestine and national wars, the Crescent gained its most signal triumph over the Cross, and the empire founded by Constantine, and embodying

the traditions of a civilisation which had lasted two thousand years, was overthrown. Christendom and Europe in the East had ceased to be conterminous; Constantinople had fallen, and the Turk was now settled in the palace of the Byzantine Emperors. This calamity it was the business of the Church and feudalism to have prevented; but they had broken down, and failed in their work. ..

The fifteenth century opens with first two, and then three, rival Popes anathematising one another, and each claiming, as vicar of Christ, the allegiance of all Christian people. Thus there was in the Church an open schism, afflicting to the consciences of the faithful; and although, some years afterwards, that wound was closed by the Council of Constance, the cicatrice remained visible, and it was not an honourable scar. The Council of Basle, which followed, proved a failure; the schism broke out afresh; and though again closed, yet it was now becoming evident that the inveterate evils in the ecclesiastical system were beyond the power of general Councils to remedy; and so the mediæval Church was carried forward until the Reformation.

The case with feudalism was even worse. The three great feudal chiefs of the middle

ages were the Emperor of Germany and the Kings of France and England. In the year 1400 the empire had lost its dignity, and the Emperor Wenceslaus was deposed, while Richard II., King of England, was murdered. In 1407, the brother of the King of France was assassinated at night in the streets of Paris, and the Duke of Burgundy, a vassal of that King, avowed the deed. Eleven years later the Dauphin, exercising the government of France, and the Duke of Burgundy pretended to effect a reconciliation, and, at their meeting together, the latter was in his turn assassinated. In the meantime, the Emperor Sigismund had committed the offence against feudalism of violating his safe-conduct; and he and the Church together shared the ignominy of putting to death the reformer John Huss, by means of a judicial murder.* Then was seen the coalition between Charles VI. of France and his infamous Queen with the foreigner, against their own son, in order to deprive the latter of his succession to the monarchy. The general infection spread even as far as Scotland, where James I., having undertaken the task of curbing the licentious-

* The Emperor Charles V. justly appreciated the odium incurred by his predecessor Sigismund, and refused to repeat the same conduct in the case of Luther.

ness of his nobility, was murdered in consequence, under circumstances of peculiar infamy and atrocity. The good Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, brother of Henry V. of England, is the next royal victim who was murdered; and then came the Civil War of the Roses, succeeding to the civil wars of France, and the demoralization increased. Edward, Prince of Wales, the only son of Henry VI. and Margaret of Anjou, is now murdered; and, not long afterwards, Henry himself is dethroned, and suddenly found dead, under the suspicion of having been murdered. He is succeeded by Edward IV., whose brother, the Duke of Clarence, conspires against him, and that brother is by the King's orders put to death. Edward IV. dies, leaving behind him two sons, the elder of whom is King of England, and both of them are murdered by their uncle, who usurps the throne; and the latter sovereign, after a reign of two years, is slain by his subjects in the battle of Bosworth Field. We might have wished that a less terrible expiation had sufficed for the heroic line of the Plantagenets, who, with all their errors, had loved England so well, and had laboured so strenuously for her welfare.* Such,

* Lord Bacon, while condemning Richard III., admits that he was "a Prince in military virtue approved, jealous of the honour of the

however, was the morality exemplifying the faith of feudalism. The institution which had been the safeguard of Europe, and which had produced Frederic Barbarossa, St. Louis, and our Edward I., came to be represented, within the same year, by the two rivals in iniquity bearing the titles of Louis XI. of France and Richard III. of England; while Spain, which had just emerged into existence as a consolidated kingdom, displayed its secular policy in the perjuries of Ferdinand of Aragon, and its religion in the fires of the recently-established Inquisition. But the most formidable symptom of those times came to light not long afterwards in Italy; and that land, so fertile in genius and in guilt, with the headship of the Church in the midst of her, was precisely the one which might have been expected to reveal it. There courage and truth were jeered at as imbecility by princes and governments whose armies encountered each other without danger, and fought battles in which not a single soldier on either side was slain;* there, beneath the forms of elegance and repose, unutterable pollution was rife; there

English nation, and likewise a good lawgiver, for the ease and solace of the common people."

* This fact is attested by Machiavelli, in his *History of Florence*, as well as by Philip de Comines.

cruelty, despising the assaults of rude violence, indulged in artistic deeds of the Ugolino kind, for which no adequate name has been invented; there illicit love degenerated into incest, while the favourite form of murder was by poison. And there Machiavelli, mistaking the depravity which had been prevalent for the stable and normal condition of human affairs, fell into an utter distrust of manhood, and looking within himself, where he found nothing to contradict him, he produced, in his "Prince," a work of the highest intellectual power, dethroning conscience, and teaching how crime may be committed advantageously, and rendered commendable. It was long since the grateful genius of Dante had imagined that the wisdom, love, and goodness which nourished the admirable Prince who befriended him, were to bring about a time when Italy should enjoy herself in a political paradise.* Machiavelli's principles found her in purgatory, and they plunged her into the abyss where all hope has to be abandoned—a fine thing for a statesman who worshipped success to do for his country.† Such a condition of society, however,

* *Inferno*, c. 1.

† This is not the place to argue in defence of our theory of Machiavelli's *Prince*; but we may present a contrast. Contemporary with Machiavelli was Edmund Dudley, the iniquitous Minister of our Henry VII., and the founder of the Dudley family, which aspired to become a

as had existed, was not suited to endure beyond Italy. The middle ages had come to an end; the wine of feudalism was drunk out; and two strong men, becoming intoxicated with the dregs, and rushing headlong to their own destruction, inflicted upon the institution whose champions they were in France and England, a blow which was the precursor of death. These were Charles the Bold and Warwick the Kingmaker.*

Now all the acts of violence and iniquity which we have described happened within a space hardly longer than the lifetime of Charles of Orleans, and it was amidst the debasement

royal dynasty, when his grandson, Lord Guilford Dudley, married Lady Jane Grey. Upon the accession of Henry VIII. Edmund Dudley was imprisoned, and afterwards executed. During his imprisonment he, like Machiavelli, wrote a treatise upon government, which he addressed to his sovereign, with a view to propitiate him, and to avert his own condemnation. His work is called *The Tree of the Commonwealth*; and we remember, prior to its publication, to have read it in the manuscript formerly belonging to Queen Elizabeth's favourite, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. The treatise is full of the purest sentiments; and, though it was not successful in saving the author from the doom which he had incurred, yet who shall venture to affirm that it produced no result? That treatise was an heirloom in the Dudley family; and the blood of the rapacious Minister produced the highest example of varied excellence which the English nation has given to the world, in his great-grandson, Sir Philip Sidney.

* The Earl of Warwick was killed at the battle of Barnet, in 1471; and within a year or two afterwards (12 Edward IV.) Taltarum's case was decided in the Court of Common Pleas. The effect of the judgment then given was to destroy the old law of strict entail, which rendered land inalienable, and had been the chief support of the feudal system in England. The nobility had caused this law to be introduced by the statute *De Donis*, two centuries previously.

which they evince that the "Debate between the Heralds" was written.

Happily these events, though prominent in the foreground, do not occupy the whole of the picture. The fifteenth century presents to us, indeed, in the disorganisation of the Church and feudalism, much that is unprepossessing; yet, notwithstanding the excess of evil, that era will ever be regarded with favour on account of the benefits which it has conferred upon posterity. The main stream of public life may have been turbid, but numerous rivulets flowing into it maintained their clearness. Nor was the freedom from reproach confined to the members of any single class. Henry VI. of England, on account of his private virtues, was thought worthy of canonisation; and the character of Joan of Arc, the more it has been scrutinised, the more it has been found to excite admiration. The travellers of that age whose narratives have reached us afford evidence that the writers were for the most part worthy men, as well as Christian gentlemen. No doubt they were the types of many others who have noiselessly passed away, and that the hamlet, the walled-town, the manor-house, and the castle, could show, in the purity of the family life of their inmates, how hard it is thoroughly to corrupt a Christian

people. At the same moment when the Turks were battering the walls of Constantinople, the silent labours of Gutenberg, in propagating the art of printing, were making amends for the downfall of crumbling fortifications and institutions. Nor was the capture of the bulwark of Christendom an unqualified disaster, since the learned men who fled from the city carried with them into Italy and elsewhere the surviving culture which had shone out in the flourishing period of Attica and Ionia; and thus they communicated to Western civilisation a new impulse, in the absence of which our own age might have lacked the enlightenment which has been transmitted from the marvellous effulgence of Greece. The application of gunpowder to the purposes of war, also an invention of that period, tended to break down the system of caste, which the continent of Europe was in danger of falling into, and which degrades human nature, as in India, by petrifying society.* Last of all came the crowning achievement which distinguishes the fifteenth century, in the discovery of America.

* The French nobility had succeeded in discrediting amongst their countrymen the use of the bow, which they stigmatised as a cowardly weapon, by means of which a man killed his enemy from a distance, without daring to look him in the face.

II.

The battle of Chatillon, to which the author of the "Debate" alludes, as having been gained by the King of France over Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, closes the last scene of the drama in which England and France had been acting throughout the preceding four centuries.* The territorial struggle was over, the dominion of the English race in France had come to an end, and that kingdom was left free to follow the course of its natural development. It is well that the catastrophe should have been as it proved. There is little gratitude due to the destroyers of illustrious nationalities which have deserved to live, and which contained the promise of future vigorous life. What would it have been but to commit over again one of the worst crimes against humanity, if Agincourt had proved to be a second Chæronæa, and France had been ruined? Fortunately Henry V. was not succeeded by a son of full age, possessed of military genius; and there was no Rome in the background. It is well that the English invaders should have been expelled from the French soil or annihilated, rather than that posterity should

* P. 46, *supra*.

have missed the example of an independent nation like France, ennobled by its long array of magnificent traditions, and by its many virtues ; its swift sympathy with all that is great and excellent ; its matchless social instinct, courtesy, and bright intelligence ; its kindness to the political exile, and to the stranger from all lands ; its generosity and courage in encountering hardships and dangers for the welfare of Europe ; its elasticity under reverses which would have crushed out the life of a less gallant spirit ; and withal, a disposition, though liable greatly to err, and to be seduced by delusive visions of glory, yet compensating its errors by a passionate love for mankind, which has in it something that is inexpressibly charming and endearing. The foreigner always prefers France next to his own country ; which proves that, amongst the nations, she is the best beloved of them all. It is no derogation from the honour of the French, while it ought to be a lesson to the English, that in the crisis involving the future of both nations at the siege of Orleans, our countrymen were vanquished by the heroism of a woman.* France, it has been remarked, can plunge more deeply into guilt than any other nation, without being deeply depraved. The reason is that, like

* P. 158, *supra*.

Athens of old, when her hour of fierce passion is over, she is sorry for the excesses into which she has been betrayed, and has the grace to repent. She has loved humanity too well ever to have become hardened in iniquity. The pride and hardheartedness of Rome deprived the ancient mistress of the world of the power of repentance; and hence, notwithstanding her inestimable services to civilisation, it was her destiny to perish "hopeless and abhorred." Yet, though it might now be difficult to justify the aggressions of England against France in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, they required no excuse in the age when they were committed. As civilisation proceeds, the standard of rectitude becomes higher, and war as a pastime is deemed immoral. Under the feudal system fighting formed the most reputable diversion of life. The Hundred Years' War with France, therefore, was only the return match for the Hundred and Fifty Years' War which the races inhabiting that country had waged in England from the Norman invasion down to Magna Charta; while Cressy, Poitiers, and Agincourt were part of the score won by three skilful players, which might be set off against the successful innings of the Conqueror at Hastings. There is, however, a less favourable aspect of the subject than depends upon the

fleeting character of arbitrary opinion. Over and above the sufferings which it inflicts upon its victims, injustice becomes hurtful to the agents which it employs in a long course of action, since it has the faculty of ruining what is temporary, while it deteriorates what has relationship with the eternal. It was not consistent with the moral government which, in spite of much that is inexplicable, prevails over the fortune of nations, that England should have been permitted to desolate France throughout more than a hundred and twenty years with impunity. The Romish clergy, in order to avoid an imminent reformation, had stimulated Henry V. to undertake the latter and most unwarrantable part of the enterprise, and was rooted out in a century; while the feudal nobility, which had promoted his designs, was destroyed earlier, in the War of the Roses. The King himself, at the height of his success, had extorted the Treaty of Troyes, which was alike deplorable to France and fatal to his own race. French princesses, indeed, have seldom brought with them good fortune across the Channel; but the Queen whom Henry married under that treaty, by introducing the blood of the house of Valois into the English royal family, entailed upon her son the mental infirmity which was

the prime cause of the extirpation of the Plantagenets. Thus, the royal line, the Church, and the nobility were doomed to perish. The main body of a people, however, is not disposed of so quickly; for though it may languish and suffer, or be struck with grievous disease, it is a corporation which does not easily die. Yet the English people, which had applauded and aided with all their might the ambition of their kings, had also to share in the retribution that followed. Foiled in their endeavours to retain the foreign possessions which they had purchased so dearly, and deprived of all extraneous means of enrichment; impoverished by seasons of scarcity, straitened in their commerce, and no longer triumphant on the sea; flung back upon the resources of their native land, which had become a prey to the hordes of placemen and adventurers accustomed to revel in the spoils of France, and who now fled home, rapacious, exasperated, and ready to tear one another to pieces; lastly, plunged into anarchy, decimated by civil war, and fearful of foreign invasion, the result of all their victories is thus summed up by a contemporary historian of the life of Henry VI.:—

“ Our enemies laugh at us and say, ‘ Take the ship off from your gold coin, and stamp a sheep upon it, in token of your

foolishness ;' since we, who were wont to be the conquerors, are now become the conquered of all nations. It was said of old that the sea is the wall of England ; and now that our enemies are upon the wall, what, think you, they will do to the dwellers by, who are unprepared against them ? Owing to the neglect of many years, it has come to pass that our ships are few in number, while our sailors are not many, and even these are unskilful for want of experience. May the Lord take away our reproach, and stir up the spirit of courage in our country ! May He lay bare the false and pretended friendship of other nations, lest, whilst we are not apprehensive of them, they suddenly fall upon us."*

But good also is educed out of evil, or mankind would long ago have been destroyed by their own vices. One class of Englishmen escaped the injurious effects of the national contagion, and profiting by the weakness of every other, gathered strength during the French wars. The humblest class of all, the poor and enthralled serfs, who were in no way responsible for the government of the kingdom, had become free men. How the emancipation was effected is not readily explained, though it is clear that when Edward

* Capgrave, *Liber de illustribus Henricis*, p. 135. Mr. Hingeston, who translated Capgrave's work, has also pointed out the play upon the words *ship* and *sheep*, in the first sentence of this quotation. When Edward III. introduced a gold currency into England, he caused a ship to be represented upon it ; and this emblem had been adopted by him and continued by his successors, in order to show that the sovereigns of England claimed to be kings of the sea. Hence the ship upon the ancient gold coinage was formerly a familiar image, like the figure of Britannia holding the Trident, which now appears upon our copper coinage, in company with the less prominent ship and lighthouse.

III. set up his claim to the crown of France, a very considerable number of his subjects were villeins and bondsmen; and that when the last Plantagenet king went down to his unhonoured tomb, villeinage in England was virtually extinguished. If, moreover, we pass by the question of right involved in the latest invasion of France, we may claim for our King a beneficent purpose behind his ambition. William the Norman found the English a "free people, and it was from no want of will that he did not reduce them to slavery. Henry V. knew that the commons of France were suffering and oppressed; and he set out by proclaiming his design of restoring to them the liberties which they had formerly enjoyed under St. Louis.* Of these liberties the French people had been deprived by the usurpation of their kings, and the selfishness of their princes and nobles; and the previous wars with England had furnished the opportunity for effecting that iniquity.†. France had struck the

* Juv. des Ursins, *Hist. de Charles VI.*, p. 292.

† Fortescue explains the whole matter, and adds, that neither St. Louis "nor any of his progenitors set never tailles or other impositions upon the people of that land without the assent of the Three Estates, which, when they be assembled, are like to the Court of Parliament in England" (*Abs. and Lim. Monarchy*, ch. 3). See also the sagacious and impressive remarks of Philip de Comines upon the same subject (*Mém.* l. vi., c. 7). In the notes to the *Grand Customier of Normandy*, an anecdote is related of our Richard I., which serves to show that in

first blow ; which, instead of destroying English liberty, destroyed her own ; for the consequences of the Norman invasion are traceable throughout the history of both nations from the Battle of Hastings down to the present hour. Nor should it be forgotten that the intrepidity, energy, and endurance which our forefathers had displayed throughout the contest with France were of avail to their descendants in after times. It was the fortune of England in the seventeenth century to be governed by a dynasty of kings whose policy tended to enfeeble and debase their people, and who would have ruined the character of any people which had offered to them a less determined resistance. Living mostly for frivolities, and deficient in capacity, courage, and affection, the Stuarts were destitute of the chief qualities which ought to belong to the rulers of men. Governing, as they did, three kingdoms, differing in features of national character, yet each possessing its own distinctive titles to esteem, it might have been

the twelfth century the old English proverb, "*Every man's house is his castle*," existed in Normandy, under the form of "*Every man is a king in his own house*;" and that the proverb applied even to the house of a peasant. It further appears from Juvenal des Ursins (p. 104) that France, towards the end of the fourteenth century, might have secured herself against future attacks from England, if her princes and nobles had not preferred, out of jealousy to the commonalty, to extinguish the liberties, and put in jeopardy the independence of their common country.

thought that they would find in one of them at least something to approve and admire ; but they could not. They did not love England ; they hated Scotland, and they despised Ireland. When England was languishing under the government of the Stuarts, while the French, who had become united and strong, were pursuing their career of victory, in the earlier days of their Grand Monarch, Louis XIV. ; when not only France, but Germany and Spain, and for a moment even Holland, took the lead of England ; in those evil days when Charles II. had degraded his high office to become the satrap of the Great King, and the most profligate traitor in the realm was to be found upon the throne of England—it was of some consequence to his subjects that they could look back upon a past in which their political relations with France had been less humiliating, and that they could remember that the fitful splendours of the Commonwealth, recently flashing across the gloom, were only gleams of the glory which, before the coming in of the Stuarts, had been their ancient inheritance. And so, under his successor, it was no slight advantage that public opinion was able to cover over the technical precedents of prerogative, which might be pleaded before corrupt judges, with the his-

torical trophies of Magna Charta* and the Reformation; and that there was forthcoming the old spirit to carry to the last court of appeal questions which implicated the honour and affected the heart of the nation.

III.

Thus were the English, in the middle of the fifteenth century, expelled out of France, beset with enemies on every side, and left with but one faithful friend to sympathise with them

* Our German kinsmen, whether Protestant or Catholic, seem to be capable of appreciating the importance of Magna Charta, if we may judge from their modern literature; since we find Neander, in his *Life of Christ*, describing the Sermon on the Mount as *The Magna Charta of the kingdom of God*; and Döllinger, from an opposite point of view, designating the Power of the Keys, *The Magna Charta of the Church*. The instinct of the Germans has led them to comprehend the significance of that fundamental law, which has to bear a superstructure for them also. At the battle of Bovines, in which the Germans were aided by our King John, the Celts obtained their most renowned triumph over the Saxons; and that victory inaugurated the splendid military career of the French nation. Magna Charta, which followed immediately afterwards, was the compensation granted to the Teutonic race.

It is curious to observe that, while Joinville speaks quite naturally of our King Henry II. as *Henry the Great*; while Henry V. was also entitled abroad *Henry the Great*; and while Henry VIII., in his lifetime and after his death, was called, even by foreign Catholics, *Henry the Great*, the English have repudiated these titles, as well as the title of *Great* for any other of their sovereigns, and have reserved it for the *Great Charter* of their liberties. With their national reverence for law, they have constantly ascribed to the most venerable and venerated of their statutes the character of greatness which they have refused to attribute to a man.

in their distress.* Was England then so detested of God, and so bereft of courage and strength, as Charles of Orleans has represented?† and was there no mission left for her to execute in the future progress of civilisation? The answer to this inquiry might have been divined from the pages of Fortescue, to which we have formerly made allusion.‡ In them will be found displayed the earnestness of political life, the enthusiastic attachment to liberty, and the power of endurance unto the end in its defence, which have constituted, for more than a thousand years, the prerogative of the English people. That people recovered itself within a single generation; and before the close of the fifteenth century, Philip de Comines pronounced, in a well-known passage of his History, that of all the kingdoms he was acquainted with, England was the happiest and the best governed.

The cause of this happiness was the freedom enjoyed by the English; their title to which they had brought with them out of the forests of Germany. They had held this freedom amidst strife and confusion, from the time of their first crossing the Channel down to the death of the Confessor; they had never ceased to insist upon it as their inalienable heritage, even while out of

* *Supra*, p. 108.

† *Ib.* p. 164.

‡ *Ib.* p. xiii.

possession under the Norman tyranny ; and they had re-entered upon it, in full right under Magna Charta, because, while the disseisin lasted, they had not failed to make continual claim.*

Then the nation had proceeded to provide further securities for the future. By the end

* These statements will be found to clash with the theories of Augustin Thierry ; but his work on the Conquest of England by the Normans, though remarkable alike for genius, learning, and eloquence, is open to grave objection as a history. It resembles rather the pleading of an advocate, who ignores inconvenient facts which can neither be explained nor controverted. Much of the affirmative evidence on which he relies must be received with caution, since it proceeds from monkish writers, who had quitted the world, instead of remaining in it to do battle against the evil. Thierry has fully appreciated, in another work, the privileges anciently enjoyed by the communes of France ; but he has failed to perceive that the whole of England was one commune, more free, and having a better title to its freedom, than any French commune. Even between the Norman Conquest and Magna Charta, the gloomiest period in our constitutional history, it is certain that the spirit of liberty never died out ; as is proved by the charters of Henry I., Stephen, and Henry II. There was no such generosity of character in these sovereigns that they were likely to grant more than necessity compelled them ; and it would be unreasonable to suppose that their charters, which, by the common law of Europe during the middle ages, were regarded in the light of legislative acts, could ever have been wholly forgotten or invalidated, whatever may be urged to the contrary. They may have been frequently violated in the turbulent twelfth century, as Magna Charta itself was afterwards violated ; but though, according to the authority of Lord Coke, that statute required to be confirmed more than thirty times, there can be no question as to its constant binding force. Indeed, every Englishman who has been born, and who has lived out half the allotted period of human life, has had good reason, at one time or another of his existence, not to despair of the liberties of his country. Only thirty-five years elapsed between the Norman Conquest and Henry I.'s charter, which said to our countrymen, "*Lagam Edwardi regis vobis reddo.*" In the days before Acts of Parliament were known, that charter stood in the place of them.

of the thirteenth century the courts of justice, in which every man might apply for the redress of injuries, had been firmly established;* the ancient great Council of the realm had given place to the modern Parliament; and so rapidly did the power of the national assembly increase, that the first burgess who sat in it might have survived to take part in the deposition of his sovereign lord, Edward II. In the succeeding reign had commenced a century of victory and conquest, during which "little" England, as our forefathers were wont endearingly to call their country, performed the deeds which gained her an honourable place amongst the States of Europe. In the previous pages will be seen what the English achieved in that period. It will be seen that upon the ocean they were supreme; that they claimed to be kings of the sea, and that their claim was allowed.† Upon the land they preceded Spain in the sixteenth, and France in the seventeenth century, as the conquering nation of Europe. And if they were thus distinguished in the material world, they were no less so in the spiritual. They had produced, in Chaucer, the greatest poet on this side the Alps, as well

* See the *Year Books* of Edward I., edited and translated by Mr. Horwood. A lawyer will recognise at once, that the main principles of the common law were at that time in full activity.

† *Supra*, pp. 17 and 47.

as Wickliffe, the precursor of the Reformation. Few as they were in number, they took rank at the Council of Constance as one of the Four Nations, into which the Christian world was divided; and when the Council was threatened by an imminent peril, Christendom showed its confidence in them by committing the recalcitrant Pope to the custody of the King of England. It is the first Prince of the blood of France, who, in relating the events which had taken place during his life, thus addresses the English: "There was a time when your conquests had reached as far as the river Loire, and even beyond; yet all this did not happen without your having to fight great battles and meeting with strong resistance."* We may rightly sympathise with the Prince in the burst of feeling which, in the "Debate between the Heralds," precedes the passage here quoted, and we may condemn the aggression of Henry V.; but it would be unnatural if descendants of the English race should fail to be sensible of the greatness of their countrymen, which is implied in this experience of the Duke of Orleans. The battle of Auray had decided the fate of a province; the battle of Naxera, that of a kingdom.† In each of them the Constable of France, Bertrand Duguesclin,

* *Supra*, p. 44.

† *Ib.* p. 34.

had been taken prisoner; and yet these great battles won by the English dwindle into insignificance by the side of others which were greater. At last the English dominion in France had come to an end. It was only natural that Charles of Orleans should rejoice in the triumph of his country; and we English at the present day cannot wish that the event should have been reversed. The energies of England had been overstrained in an enterprise which, though warrantable according to the maxims of the age, was essentially unjust; and a period of lassitude and suffering intervened, before the nation began to collect again the strength which was needful in its further career. God had not utterly forsaken our country, for there was important work still left for her to perform.

And now the business of England henceforward was to improve her own institutions; to become the champion of the approaching Reformation; to uphold the cause of civil and religious liberty; to fight for the independence of Europe; to afford an example of free, secure, and progressive government; and no longer to squander her race over the old barren fields of feudal ambition, but to plant it in the virgin soil of more promising lands, where it might increase and multiply, and where—instinctively avoiding

all commixture with surrounding inferior races—it might bring forth worthy descendants to fill up the void places of the earth. That, in spite of occasional backslidings, she has in the long run been faithful to her mission, is patent in the present constitution of the most flourishing States of the world. It is difficult to conceive where, but for England, would have been now the independence of the various nations, whose free intercommunication has promoted and still carries forward the highest interests of humanity, or where would have been the political liberties of their inhabitants. At home her laws, and abroad her fleets and armies, have had for their object, not to conquer and enslave, but to liberate. That is the aim of her empire. It was no selfish contest which she engaged in when she resisted Philip II., Louis XIV., or Napoleon; nor was it any enterprise of ambition which she undertook when she proceeded to lay the foundations of an empire in America.

And here, at the expense of being considered discursive, we will presume to advert to the fortune of the powerful nation to which England has given birth.

When the European kingdoms in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, dispatched their adventurous sons to seek for ampler dominions in

the New World, the course which England pursued was unmoved by the lust of conquest. Dazzled by the splendid exploits and rewards of the Spanish conquerors, who were first in the field, or indignant at their intolerance and atrocious cruelties, mankind took little heed of the scattered bands of Englishmen who went forth in humble steadfastness to plant the Wilderness. These latter carried with them the indestructible elements of their national character; and they were the children of fathers who had brought down the high looks of the countrymen of Cortes and Pizarro. Many of them would have preferred remaining behind, to fight once more the battle of freedom, and rescue Germany from the horrors of the Thirty Years' War; only their timid sovereign wanted heart to carry out the national policy. They had lost their glorious Queen; they could no longer hope to increase the stock of honour which her reign had accumulated; their religion was persecuted; and yet they entered upon their adopted country with their loyalty, their piety, and their patriotism unimpaired.* They have immortalised the memory of these virtues, alike in deeds, and in the names of their early settlements, Virginia, Providence, New Plymouth, New England. Above all, fol-

* See the note, p. 215, *infra*.

lowing the light that was in them, they sought to establish a kingdom for God ; and though at times the light may have been dubious, leading them into strange paths, yet their endeavour has been rewarded by the establishment of a dominion, destined to be greater than kingdoms, for their posterity. And now their settlements have grown into the United States of America. Amidst all the vicissitudes which these settlements have undergone, they have never become denationalised. In their profound disagreement with the mother country, they avoided the last act of estrangement, by declining to adopt a new family name ; and Europe has done justice to Old England by continuing to call their citizens the Anglo-Americans. The Spaniards intermarried with the native populations, and have become Mexicans, Peruvians, Chilians, Venezuelans, and other Indian half-castes; the Portuguese have become Brazilians ; the French, Canadians : the English are the English still. Beneath the burning sun of the New World the Celtic hosts have melted away like the ice which has drifted southward, while the Teutonic have been fused into a rock.* In each instance the instinct originally im-

* The German, Dutch, and Scandinavian immigration into North America has been more extensive than is commonly allowed for in England ; and it is exactly out of these elements that the English race is composed.

planted by nature has prevailed. When the various tribes which pass under the appellation of Anglo-Saxons had conquered England, and had driven out, or exterminated, almost all the former inhabitants, a law was imposed upon their race, that it should become adapted for the assimilation of the other superior races which might come into contact with it, but should itself remain incapable of being absorbed. In obedience to this law, the race blended with itself into one common family the Danes and the Normans, who, in early times, successfully invaded the kingdom, and subsequently the unfailing stream of aliens who have been pouring into it, either to improve their fortune, or to escape from persecution ;* but, although the English have been slain by thousands in France, Germany, Spain, and every quarter of the globe, there is no authentic tradition that any portion of the Anglo-Saxon race has ever been incorporated into a foreign nation.† England has always

* Defoe's satire of *The True-born Englishman* amusingly describes the mixed character of the English people.

† There are many traditions, indeed, but the difficulty is to establish any one of them upon an historical basis. The earliest appears to be that of the Saxons and Danes who fled from England after the Norman Conquest, about the year 1080, and joined the Varangian Guard at Constantinople, where they continued in the service of the Byzantine Court, and preserved the use of their native language until the overthrow of the Eastern Empire. If, however, we admit the truth of this tradition,

received with open arms the foreigner from the Continent, who came peaceably, and prepared to

and, as its necessary consequence, that the English soldiers retained their nationality during a period little short of four hundred years, the fact would only serve to show the sturdiness of the race, unless it could be proved that our countrymen afterwards discredited themselves by becoming renegades and Turks.

The mixed bands who, in the twelfth century, followed Richard Strongbow into Ireland, and whose descendants are said to have become more Irish than the Irish themselves, consisted of Normans, Welshmen, and adventurers from all quarters, and cannot be called Anglo-Saxons.

Scotland, though a hostile, could never be regarded in the light of a foreign nation, though her political divergency and historical associations, supported by her courage, maintained her in a lofty independence prior to the Union; for the Lowlanders constituted the most numerous and enterprising part of her population, and they are English in blood and language.

There is a vague tradition, also of the twelfth century, that a body of English crusaders, on their voyage homeward from the Holy Land, disembarked in Portugal, joined the Christian inhabitants in their warfare against the Moors, and afterwards settled in the conquered country. This last circumstance would have been interesting, if it could be verified, in consequence of the intimate connexion which, from the earliest times, has existed between the kingdoms of Portugal and England.

During the English dominion in France, which ran parallel to the alleged service with the Varangians at Constantinople, and continued nearly four centuries, the family life of England could no more be transferred to the Continent than it could since to India; if we except Calais, which became an English town, and restored its population to England upon the recapture in 1558. A French writer, before the existence of the Second Empire, remarking upon the circumstance that the English princess, Mary Tudor, presented no heir to her consort Louis XII., says, "It was the will of Heaven that not a single drop of English blood should flow in the veins of the kings of France!"

The nearest approach to an English emigration, resembling that of the Protestants of the Low Countries driven out by the Duke of Alva, or of the French Protestants after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, occurred in the middle of the reign of Queen Elizabeth; but many of

cast in with her his lot;* nor has the race suffered detriment from its receptive faculty. But with any inferior race the English has always refused to coalesce. Such is the destiny which has been inherited by the people of the United States; and this fact, coupled with their inherent force of character, explains the secret of their progress. It is said that the waters of the Mississippi run bright and clear before they are joined by the Missouri, after which they become turbid, like their affluent; and the same result has followed the confluence of the Celtic with the Indian race. By shunning this intermixture, the

the English fugitives returned home afterwards, and those left behind became seminary priests, monks, or soldiers, and never married.

There are few more touching incidents in the common history of England and the United States than that of the congregation of English exiles who had been settled during ten years at Leyden, and who, being strongly tempted to abandon their nationality, so firmly refused. It was this congregation, afterwards venerated as the Puritan Fathers, who quitted Holland in 1620, sailed to America in the Mayflower, and founded the States of New England. Amongst the reasons which they assigned for emigration, this stands conspicuous: "That their posterity would in a few generations become Dutch, and so lose their interest in the English nation; they being desirous rather to enlarge his Majesty's dominions, and to live under their natural prince."

* The law of England, since the reign of Edward III., has favoured the foreigner by a jury *de medietate*, while the old French law proscribed him by means of the barbarous right *d'aubaine*, which was not abolished until the year 1790.

The foreign aspect of the names which meet the eye of a passenger through the principal streets of business in our metropolis show that the immigration into England is still going on; while, amongst the foreign families who have entered our country since the revolution, more than one has enjoyed the distinction of giving a prime minister to England.

English race has preserved beyond the Atlantic the lustre of the European family. Like the broad river separating that part of the Northern continent which remains attached to the mother country from the other which has established itself independently, the race flows on unaffected in its depths by the streams which run into it. All the crime which England in former days transported to her penal colonies upon that continent has not left a trace in the character of the United States; and a people which possessed virtue sufficient to imbibe without a stain such loads of guilt, may well be trusted for the future. In any case, the Anglo-Americans are of our blood, bone, and flesh. They are proud of their Anglo-Saxon descent, and not without reason. We have seen what the English were, and what they did in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, before America was discovered. The author of the "Debate" declares that they were Saxons, and, therefore, of necessity, Anglo-Saxons.* The energy of the most energetic people of Europe in that age was transmitted to their descendants, who founded the United States of America, and who have handed it down to the present. The same energy has followed

* *Supra*, p. 19.

also the other children of England who have settled beyond her ancient borders, and who are not comprehended within the United States, but who will have to be reckoned with hereafter.

These reflections, however, it may be thought, have already led us too far, and we must return to our proper subject.

Henry V. of England, before he died, at the age of thirty-three,* did not doubt that he should conquer France; and he seems to have conceived the design of cementing both nations together, by leading their combined forces against the infidels, who were then advancing upon Europe.† What the emulation of the two Western Powers, guided by a commander of Henry's genius, might have accomplished in that direction, it would be idle now to speculate upon, since all hope of such a consummation perished when he expired. The dominion of the English upon the Continent did not long survive their heroic King. If we revert to the year 1453, which has afforded us a point of view for obtaining a glimpse of the fifteenth century, we shall find that it is pre-

* Alexander the Great died at the age of thirty-two.

† Tytler's *Life of Henry V.*, vol. ii., p. 315, and the authorities referred to in that work.

eminently distinguished in our European annals by its closing the central period known as the Middle Ages, and that it witnessed two capital events—the expulsion of the English from France, and the capture of Constantinople by the Turks. Liberty receding in the West, as despotism advanced in the East, was not a favourable omen inaugurating our modern era ; yet there, at the same instant, the armies of the two representative nations were fighting with a different fortune. There were the English and the Turks, widely separated from each other, with Europe in the midst ; the former vanquished, the latter victorious. And there, behind the events of the moment, each nation embodied its special principle of action, pointing to a future which was not then discerned ; the one leading on to justice, security, and prosperity—the other to insolent violence and rapine, to be followed by exhaustion, decrepitude, and dissolution. The double crisis in human progress had come at last. The watch-dog withdrew sullenly, on one side of the continental fold, to the great joy of the shepherds, as the wolf entered at the other. Four hundred years and more have since elapsed, during which time the wolf has not spared the flock ; and how to be rid of him still remains the

insoluble problem of Christendom. In the meanwhile, too, the English have gone elsewhere. Perhaps, on the whole, they and their children beyond the oceans may have profited by the exchange.





INDEX.

ii

ADRIAN, Pope, 25
 Agincourt, Battle of, 15, 128,
 144, 148, 195, 197
 Agnes, Pope, 30
 Albion, 18
 Ale, 116
 Alençon, Duke of, 74, 178
 Alexander the Great, 85
 America, 210
 Amiens, 69
 Ampthill Castle, 149
 Ampulla, 23, 133
 Angers, 68
 Anglo-Americans, 212
 Anglo-Saxons, 213
 Anjou, Duke of, 74
 „ Margaret of, 93, 189
 Antipope, 28
 Appeal of Murder, 174
 Aquitania, 72
 Arc, Joan of, 157, 169, 178,
 193
 Archers, 57
 Arras Tapestry, 76, 143
 Arthur, King, 4, 14, 18, 99
 Artificers, 51
 Astolfo, King, 25
 Auray, Battle of, 34, 208

BARBAROSSA, Emperor, 190
 Basle, Council of, 187
 Baugé, Battle of, 151
 Bayonne, 45, 51
 Beauty, 146
 Beauvais, 73
 Beer, 116
 Biscay, 52
 Bishops, 67, 113
 Blaye, 45
 Blois, 129, 146
 Boetius, 33, 102
 Bolingbroke Castle, 149, 151
 Bourbon, Duke of, 74
 Bourdeaux, 45, 51, 53, 127
 Bourg, 45
 Bourges, 69, 80
 Brazilians, 212
 Brest, 51
 Britons, 19
 Brittany, 52, 55
 „ Duke of, 74
 Brouage, 53, 83
 Bruce, Robert, 35
 Brunet, Master, 25
 “ Brut,” The, 20, 34, 88
 Brutus of Troy, 18, 72
 Burgundy, Duke of, 43, 73, 175,
 188

- CÆSAR**, Julius, 4, 34
 Cahors, 68
 Calais, 48, 63
 Cambridge, 68
 Canadians, 212
 Carcassone, 24
 Castles, 75, 115
 Cathedrals, 68, 69
 Cattle, 62
 Châlons, 73
 Champagne, Count of, 73
 Charente, 83
 Charlemagne, 4, 25, 37, 88, 133
 Charles Martel, 24
 " the Bold, 192
 " II. of England, 203
 " V. of France, 128
 " VI. " 175
 " VII. " 44, 129,
 139
 Charroux, 69
 Chartres, 69
 Chases, 6, 10
 Chatillon, Battle of, 46, note 195
 Chaucer, 207
 Chilians, 212
 Chronicles, 133
 Church, The, 186
 Citeaux, 68
 Clairvaux, 68
 Clarence, Duke of, 189
 Clergy, 67, 68
 Cloths, 80
 Clovis, 23, 24, 100, 138
 Cluny, 68
 Coal, 52, 63, 81, 107
 Coke, John, xiii. 99
 Collegiate Churches, 68
 Comines, Philip de, 205
 Common People, 67
 " Complaint of France," 130
 Constance, Council of, xii. 70,
 187, 208
 Constantine, Emperor, 14, 18
 Constantinople, 187, 194, 218
 Cornwall, 63
 Cortes, 211
 Craftsmen, 61
 Cressy, Battle of, 15, 197
 Creton, 76, 80
 Cross, Cheapside, 79
 Crossbows, 57, 111

DANES, 213
 Dante, 191
 Darius, 85
 David, King, 4
 Denmark, 16, 42, 88
 Derby, Earl of, 88
 Desiderius, King, 25
 Dieppe, 50
 Dovor, 148
 " Dream of the Orchard," 25,
 100
 Duguesclin, 34, 208
 Dukes, 75
 Dunois, Count, 121, 159

EDWARD I., 190
 Edward II., 38, 137, 207
 Edward IV., 189
 " Prince of Wales, 189

FAMINES, 153
 Ferdinand of Aragon, 190
 Feudalism, 186
 Fish, 54, 64, 81
 Flanders, Count of, 73
 Fleurs-de-lis, 23, 133
 Fontevrault, 68
 Fortescue, Sir John, xv. 205
 Fowling, 7
 Foxes, 12
 France, 43, 84, 195
 Froissard, xix.
 Fronsac, 45
 Fruits, 62, 79

GAUL, 32
 Genoa, 59, 112, 127
 Geoffrey the Pict, 72
 Giants, 18, 73

Gironde, 83
 Godfrey of Bouillon, 4, 27
 Gold, 64, 80
 Gormond, 19
 Goshawks, 13, 98
 Granada, King of, 48, 105
 Guienne, 36, 52, 55, 73
 Gunpowder, 194
 Gutenberg, 194

HAINAULTS, 39

Hannibal, 33
 Harbours, 50
 Harfleur, 50
 Hastings, Battle of, 197, 202
 Hawking, 7, 145
 Hector of Troy, 4
 Henry IV. of England, 174
 " V. " 44, 217
 " VI. " 193
 Hesdin, Park at, 11
 Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, 189
 Hunting, 145
 Huss, John, 188

INGLUS, 19

Inquisition, Spanish, 190
 Ireland and the Irish, 41, 42
 Iron, 51
 Isabella, Queen of Edward II., 137, 153, 172
 Isabella, Queen of Richard II., 170, 177
 Italy, 190

JAMES I. of Scotland, 188

Jewellers, 76
 Joan of Arc, *See* Arc
 John, King of England, 30, 31, 37, 102, 137
 John, King of France, 35, 103, 137
 Judas Maccabeus, 4

KATHERINE, Queen of
 Henry V., 170
 Kings of the Sea, 17, 47

LA BASSEÉ, 53

Ladies, 6, 10
 Lancaster, Duke of, 74
 Langres, 73
 Languedoc, 74
 Laon, 73
 La Rochelle, 51, 53
 Lay, 83
 Libourne, 45
 Loire, 72, 82
 Louis XI., 190
 " XII., 128
 " XIV., 210
 " Son of Philip Augustus, 37
 " Duke of Orleans, 175, 177
 Lusignan, Park at, 11
 Lyons, 81

MACHIAVELLI, 191

Magna Charta, 197, 204
 Magnificence, Wars of, 21, 23, 27, 89, 101, 153
 Maniple, 28
 Maximian, 14, 18
 Maximilian, Emperor, xii.
 Mechanics, 76
 Merchandise, 50, 53, 65
 Meux, 45
 Mexicans, 212
 Mines, 63, 80
 Monstrelet, xix. 128
 Montivilliers, 80
 Montpellier, 68
 Mother-Abbeys, 68

NAPOLEON I., 210

Nations, The Four, 70
 Naxera, Battle of, 34, 208
 New England, 211
 New Plymouth, 211
 Nine Worthies, 5, 27, 34, 92

Nobles and Nobility, 61, 67, 72,
73

Normandy, 36, 45
" Duke of, 22, 73

Normans, 213

Noyon, 73

OLIVER, 4, 27, 133

Oriflamme, 24, 133

Orleans, Duke of, 43, 74, 128,
143

Orleans, City of, 158

" University of, 68

Orleans and Burgundy, 153

Oxford, 68

PANDULPH, 30

Paper, 76

Paris, 45, 68, 69, 80

Parks, 6, 10, 96

Partridges, 7, 13, 97

Pastime, 91

Patay, Battle of, 156

People, 61

" of the Clergy, &c., 142

Pepin, King, 25

Peruvians, 212

Peter-pence, 31

Pheasants, 13, 98

Philip the Fortunate, 36, 45

Philip II. of Spain, 210

Phœbus, Count, 10

Pizarro, 211

Pleasures, 6

Poitiers, Battle of, 15, 24, 144,
197

Poitiers, University, 68

Pontefract Castle, 149, 151, 179

Pontoise, 45

Portugal, 56, 108

Precedency, 94

"Prince," The, 191

Providence, 211

REFORMATION, 204

Relics, 69, 133

Rheims, 69, 73, 156

Rhone, 80, 82

Richard I., 22

" II., 86, 87, 118, 170

" III., 190

Riches, 61, 67, 85

Roanne, 82

Roland, 4, 27, 133

Roses, War of the, 198

Rouen, 69, 80

SAFE-CONDUCTS, 52, 55

St. Emilion, 45

St. Louis, 133, 190

St. Macaire, 45

St. Malo, 51

St. Remi, 24

Saintonge, 53

Salt, 55, 78

Saltpetre, 81

Saone, 82

Saracens, 27, 133

Saxony and Saxons, 19, 216

Scipio Africanus, 33

Scotland, 16, 40

Sea-sickness, 58, 147

Seine, 82

Serfs, 200

Sèvre, 83

Sheep, 62, 79

Ships and Shipping, 17, 49

Shrewsbury, Earl of, *See* Talbot

Sigismund, Emperor, 188

Sluys, 50

Somme, 83

Spain, 42, 52

Sport, 6, 13

Stuarts, The, 203

Swin, The Great, 56

TALBOT, Earl of Shrews-
bury, 46, 127, 154, 195

Tercelets, 13, 98

Toulouse, 68, 69

" Count of, 73

Tours, 69, 72

Towns, 112
 "Tree of Battle," 86, 120
 "Treasure of Sapience," 25
 Troy, 18
 Troyes, 76
 " Treaty of, 198
 Turks, 218
 Turonus, 72

UNIVERSITIES, 68, 113
 United States, 210

VALENTINE of Milan, 175
 Valois, 198
 Valour, 14, 18
 Venezuelans, 212
 Verdegris, 76
 Verneuil, Battle of, 16, 150
 Vic, 83
 Vienne, 80
 Villeins, 201

Vincennes, Bois de, 11
 Virginia, 211

WARWICK the Kingmaker,
 192

Wenceslaus, Emperor, 188
 Wickliffe, 208
 Wildfowl, 7, 93
 William the Conqueror, 37, 88,
 201

Windsor Castle, 149

" Park, 12

Wine, 55, 78

Wingfield, Sir Robert, xii.

" Castle, 149

Wolves, 12, 97

Wood, 51

Wool, 62, 79

Worthies, *See* Nine Worthies

YORK and Lancaster, Houses
 of, 176





00035412

